THE ARYAN PATH

September 1969

THE ARYAN PATH: VOL. XL · NO. 9

September 1969

CLAUDE HOUGHTON — Faith in the Future — 371

PRATAP CHANDRA — The Alleged Silence of the Buddha—I — 375

BRIAN G. COOPER — Master Eckhart: Mystic — 379

DAVID W. ROBSON — The Light in the Experience of Quakers — 385

J. N. TANDON — Thomas Hardy's Philosophy of Life — 391

MARY CARMAN ROSE — The Encounter (Poem) — 396

FRANCIS H. ANGOLD — A Theosophical Approach to the Wagnerian Siegfried Idyll — 397

PREMA PANDURANGAN — The Conquest of Anger — 403

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

A. A. A. FYZEE — The Sikh Religion and Its Founder — 408

and reviews by

B. V. NARAYANA REDDY, A. A. ANDERSON, A. R. WADIA, E. G. LEE, R. H. WARD, K. SAMPATHGIRI RAO, SITA RAM JAYASWAL, E. GWEN MOUNTFORD, AND BRIAN G. COOPER — 411

ENDS AND SAYINGS — 418

THE ARYAN PATH

Point out the "Way" — however dimly, and
lost among the host — as does the evening star
to those who tread their path in darkness.

— *The Voice of the Silence*

VOL. XL SEPTEMBER 1969 No. 9

CLAUDE HOUGHTON

Faith in the Future

[We reprint this brief but extremely significant article, from the pen of the late Claude Houghton, from THE ARYAN PATH of August 1939. The insights which he expressed thirty years ago, before the beginning of the Second World War, are as valid and necessary today for a generation no less haunted by fear for its future.—ED.]

PROBABLY nothing reveals a man more clearly than his conception of the familiar. If we knew no more about him than this, we should know much. We should know the "givens" of his thought — the background of his mind. We should know what he regards as natural, normal, and inevitable.

This is as true of an age as it is of a man, and it may be instructive therefore to remember certain possibilities which are familiar today.

That civilization may be destroyed in the cataclysm of war; that Red revolution may engulf the world; that the present economic structure may collapse into shapeless ruin — all these have become familiar possibilities. They have ceased to be the spectral projections of a nightmare. They no longer seem as remote from actuality as a row of grinning gargoyles. We are accustomed to them. What was once fantastic has become familiar.

The fact that, even a few years ago, these possibilities would have been regarded as delirium by most people is an indication of the road we have travelled, and the rapidity of our descent. It is so dramatic an indication that it would be only too easy to contend that, although collective security has failed, collective insanity has achieved a spectacular success.

What we have to consider here, however, is the effects of the fact that a nightmare has become the normal.

The first, and the greatest, effect is that faith in the future has been destroyed. Once, men instinctively assumed that many of their institutions were permanent. There were certainties in those days. Most people unquestioningly believed in Progress; in the divine right of Property; in

the sweet simplicity of three per cent; in a future which would preserve the essential structure of the present. Evolution, not revolution, was their confident creed. Things would change — of course they would change — but only as a result of a broadening from precedent to precedent. In fundamentals, the lives of their children would resemble their own. And, for fortune's favourites, old age would be a leisurely last look round at a world which, on the whole, was a very tolerable affair.

One by one these certainties, and many others, have vanished. The future is no longer a map; it is a vast question-mark. Nothing could illustrate more poignantly the present state of Europe than the fact that, if peace could be assured even for a year, there would be an instant boom on the Stock Exchange. Yesterday's Despair is today's Hope. Values alter — when one is living from hand to mouth. A dead rat is treasure-trove to a starving man. "The art of our necessities is strange, that can make vile things precious."

A nation might be defined as a faith in the future, for clearly its countless activities are based on the instinctive assumption that they will continue to have relevance to its hopes, traditions, and ideals. Undermine that instinctive assumption, and life becomes meaningless. To what end should one labour, plan, have children? If the world is going to revert to the jungle, only gorillas should worry about a declining birth-rate.

Destroy faith in the future, and a nation ceases to be a nation. It degenerates into a mob — a mob of fear-haunted individuals — for whom the past is a dream and the future an abyss.

Nowadays it is a truism to say that "Recovery depends on a return of confidence." Actually, of course, the phrase implies that the psychological war now raging in Europe has destroyed faith in the future of trade. Lacking stable conditions, enterprise is paralysed. It is not that men have suddenly lost the initiative which accepts normal risks, but they shrink from taking risks of a totally new order. They shrink from *unimaginable* risks. Consequently, no-one knows what to do. There are no "givens," no certainties. Today, it is not "lean-look'd prophets who whisper fearful change." It's every other intelligent man you meet. Inevitably, therefore, fear grips the modern world like an iron frost.

It is fear which has destroyed faith in the future. It is fear which is piling monstrous armaments heaven-high. It is fear which is dehumanizing men. Nothing could be more paradoxical, more pathetic, and more revealing than the fact that only in frenzied preparation for war can men glimpse the ghost of Security. We've got to that. Fear is working overtime to create confidence — to ensure a future which, at any rate, will be *recognizable*.

Inevitably, therefore, the secret dread in the hearts of many men is

that evil is mighty — and that it will prevail. Everywhere evil seems to be establishing its ascendancy. Everywhere, it seems to trample underfoot everything which denies its supremacy. Its shadow lengthens and deepens over the world. More and more arrogantly it claims that it, and it alone, is Reality. And, as ever, it points to appearances to justify that claim.

The essential, therefore — unless the world is to go down into a welter of destruction — is to *repudiate evil's claim to be reality. To repudiate it instantly and finally, for to accept it, even for a moment, is dangerous.* Once you have sunk your knees and bowed your head, you no longer see what you are worshipping.

It is no new issue which confronts the modern world. It is an old issue — presented in gigantic terms. Evil has mobilized on a scale unprecedented, and is claiming allegiance — on a scale unprecedented. So imposing is its grim array that, to many, there seems no alternative to instant and abject surrender.

One result is that there are two kinds of suffering in the world today. There is physical suffering, to an unrealizable extent: and there is spiritual anguish, caused by the dread that everything which denies the omnipotence of evil is no more than a fading dream. This, perhaps, is the reason why all men in whom decency has survived recoil from the possibility of world war. They recoil because they realize that *victory — no matter on whose banners it lights — will be victory for evil, and only for evil.*

Nevertheless, in a strict sense, there can be no permanent victory for evil. There can be none because evil contains a self-destructive principle. To ally oneself with evil, therefore, is to become subject to the operation of that principle. No matter what the appearance may be — no matter how universal or how overwhelming its triumphs may seem — evil is essentially self-destructive and, paradoxically, it has power only over itself.

Swedenborg's definition of the power of evil still stands. "The evil can do evil, to the evil — only through their evil." It is of the nature of evil endlessly to commit suicide.

It would seem, therefore, that faith in the future will revive if — and only if — men resolutely refuse to be duped by evil's claim to omnipotence. Again, the issue is an old one. Judge by appearances, and evil will seem the sole reality. Judge with a righteous judgement, and it will be revealed as a lie — and the father of them. It may well be that *if we have lost faith in the future, it is because we have served the false — and are now confronted by the unmasked features of the god we have worshipped in deed, not the one we have praised with our lips.*

It is an occult doctrine that evil must be made manifest in order to

be recognized for what it is; and in order to be cast off. Lacking manifestation, evil's essential nature remains hidden — with the result that it can masquerade in many forms seductive to our pride, our apathy, or our self-satisfaction. It may even deck itself with the trappings of "religion." But, once evil is made manifest — especially on the scale on which it is manifested today — it is impossible not to recognize it for what it is. And, by attaining form, evil automatically becomes subject to the operation of its own inherent principle of self-destruction.

It is no new issue, therefore, which challenges mankind today. What is new is that the nature of the issue is apparent to all.

We may take comfort from the knowledge that when faith in the future arises in our hearts — and it will arise — it will not be that former vacillating faith which quailed before all that denied it. It will have survived ordeal by fire. It will have emerged triumphant from great tribulation.

Sooner or later faith has to descend into hell. It has to encounter the absence of God. It has to discover that God is revealed as fully by His absence as He is by His presence.

Faith is not faith till it has survived crucifixion.

CLAUDE HOUGHTON

... it is an eternal impossibility that anything can ever come from God as His will and purpose towards the creature but that same love and goodness which first created it; He must always will that to it which He willed at the creation of it. This is the amiable nature of God. He is the Good, the unchangeable, overflowing fountain of good that sends forth nothing but good to all eternity. He is the Love itself, the unmixed, unmeasurable Love, doing nothing but from love, giving nothing but gifts of love to everything that He has made; requiring nothing of all His creatures but the spirit and fruits of that love which brought them into being. Oh, how sweet is this contemplation of the height and depth of the riches of Divine Love! With what attraction must it draw every thoughtful man to return love for love to this overflowing fountain of boundless goodness!

—WILLIAM LAW

PRATAP CHANDRA

The Alleged Silence of the Buddha

[We are glad to welcome Shri Pratap Chandra as a contributor. He is Assistant Professor in the Department of Philosophy, University of Saugar. After a distinguished academic career, he has recently completed a thesis on "The Concept of Self in Early Buddhism." He has also published a few other research papers, and, though his chief interest is Buddhism, he is interested also in Symbolic Logic and contemporary thought.

As he says, much has been made of the Buddha's silence. Shri Pratap Chandra carries out a careful examination of what may be called the "silence" passages in Buddhist scripture. We print below the first part of this article.—ED.]

I

MUCH HAS BEEN MADE of the Buddha's "silence." There is hardly a work on Buddhism which does not have something to say on the subject. The Buddha is considered to be among the few religious teachers who set great store by personal conviction. His resorting to taciturnity on certain issues was, therefore, bound to prove baffling. Various interpretations have been offered. For Keith, the silence merely furnished an evidence of the Buddha's unreasoned agnosticism.[1] For Schrader, on the other hand, it has a deep significance, because, in his opinion, the Buddha "certainly does not belong to those who are silent because of their not knowing enough, but to those who do so because they know too much."[2] According to Radhakrishnan, "Buddha did not think it his duty to satisfy the metaphysical craving, though he had definite views on the metaphysical questions" because he realized "the obvious limits to the logical investigation of reality."[3]

A fresh attempt at understanding the situation is, however, not unwarranted. Unfortunately, the issue seems to have evoked uncalled-for generalizations and simplifications. Scholars have mostly singled out one or two "silence" passages, and interpreted them in the light of their preconceived notions about early Buddhism as such. What is needed is to realize the complicated and diverse nature of the "silence" passages, and arrive at an interpretation which in some way accounts for most, if not all, of them. Neither mystery-mongering nor resorting to worn-out clichés is likely to help. Methodologically, it is indefensible to single out certain

---

[1] KEITH, A.B.: *Buddhist Philosophy in India and Ceylon* (Oxford. 1923), p. 45

[2] SCHRADER, F. OTTO: "On the Problem of Nirvāṇa," *Journal of Pali Text Society* (P.T.S.), 1904-5, p. 158

[3] RADHAKRISHNAN, S.: "Indian Philosophy: Some Problems," *Mind*, 1926, p. 166

passages and treat them in isolation, forgetting that the very same questions left unanswered in these passages figure in many more, and not always in an interrogative form!

The number and nature of questions is not the same in all passages. The standard list of "unanswered" questions (*avyākatāni*) most frequently used by scholars consists of three sets. The first four questions deal with the beginning and the end of the world; the next two with the relationship between body and soul (*jīva*); and the last four with the post-mortem destiny of a Liberated One.[4] Thus, the first group of questions is cosmological, the second has bearing on morality, while the last is closely associated with the problem of *Nibbāṇa* or Liberation. Each question is clearly based on idle speculation. The last two groups often occur separately, swelling the list of "silence" passages.

These ten questions, however, are not the only ones which failed to elicit any reply from the Buddha or his prominent disciples. There are some entirely different sets of questions too. In one instance, Wanderer Vacchagotta confines himself to two queries: "Is there a self?" and "Is there not a self?"[5] These are manifestly far more basic questions, of an entirely different *genre* from the standard list. In yet another passage, a seemingly innocuous set of questions has met a similar fate: whether the whole world would escape through the Path or half of it or a third part of it.[6]

Thus, it should be noted that while all the passages featuring the "unanswered" questions are also "silence" passages, the converse is by no means true. Now what does a similar reaction to widely disparate problems indicate? Only that silence was the characteristic reply to a particular type of inquiry. This leads us on to investigate the true character of not only the questions but also the questioners.

It is important to note that the ten "unanswered" questions are not found always in an interrogative garb. They in fact seem to have been so many heretical views or *diṭṭhis*. Not only does the Buddha describe them as such, but some recluses are shown actually claiming them as their own particular theory, and they are then treated on a par with the views of the six heretical teachers.[7] Clearly, for the Buddhists, there was nothing to choose between the views put forward by Makkhali Gosala

---

[4] *Majjhima-Nikāya*, ed. TRENCKNER, V. (P.T.S., London. 1935 reprint), Vol. I, p. 426

[5] *The Book of Kindred Sayings* (Trs. of *Saṁyutta-Nikāya* by RHYS DAVIDS, C. A. F., and WOODWARD, F.L.) (P.T.S., London. 1917-30), Vol. IV, p. 282

[6] *The Book of Gradual Sayings* (Trs. of *Aṅguttara-Nikāya* by HARE, E.M., and WOODWARD, F.L.) (P.T.S., London. 1932-6), Vol. V, p. 133

[7] *The Book of Kindred Sayings, ed. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 164; *Majjhima-Nikāya, ed. cit.*, Vol. I, whole of Sutta 25 (*Nivāpa-Sutta*); *The Book of Gradual Sayings, ed. cit.*, Vol. V, pp. 128ff.; *The Verses of Uplift* (Trs. of *Udāna* by WOODWARD, F.L.) (Luzac, London. 1948), p. 81

and others and these theories propagated by some unknown recluses. Idle speculation all of them are, but it does not appear that they were supposed to be imaginary.

What is the precise import of the term "view" in early Buddhism? A view or a theory or an opinion (all these terms seem to mean the same thing in early Buddhism) comes in to describe or explain that which is not amenable to direct perception. It is therefore necessarily somewhat subjective and based on ignorance. On the contrary, one who is in possession of the requisite capacity for perception would neither put forward any "view" nor would care for those who do. The *Udāna* story of ten blind men was apparently meant to illustrate this point.[8] The blind men were like those recluses who failed to discriminate between true knowledge and mere opinion. An impaired eye-sight cannot see what can be seen only by a person with perfect vision. The Buddha, as can be shown by a large number of instances, was rather vehemently opposed to the very tendency to seek an easy way out by making do with false or imperfect knowledge instead of toiling for true insight.

Now, if this much is granted, then it becomes plain that when the Buddha announced that he had no "theories" — as he quite often did — he by no means implied that he was without any knowledge about the world or the soul, or that he had no ideas about them. It only meant that he had the privilege of seeing and hearing what lesser men, rival teachers included, could not see or hear. To drive this point home, he frequently mentioned his own faculties of clairvoyance and clairaudience. Thus, in the *Tevijja-Sutta* of the *Dīgha-Nikāya*, he stopped his adversaries from speaking about the god Brahmā, while he himself talked about the various Brahmās off and on.[9] The reason? While the Buddha had seen Brahmā many times, the rival *brāhmaṇas* (who were discussing with him the way going to union with Brahmā) or even their ancestors never had had that privilege. Similarly, on another occasion,[10] he disputed the right of some Jain monks to speak about the past lives and their impact on the present one on the ground that neither those worthies nor even their teacher (presumably Mahāvīra, who is referred to as Niganṭha-nātaputta in the Buddhist scriptures) could recall their past lives. The Buddha, again, suffered from no such limitation, which is so amply borne out by the voluminous *Jātaka* literature. What this indicates is only that Brahmās or past lives by themselves were not view-issues, but became so the moment one without any first-hand knowledge about them spoke of

---

[8] *The Verses of Uplift, ed. cit.*, p. 81

[9] Cf. *Dīgha-Nikāya*, ed. by RHYS DAVIDS, T.W., and CARPENTER, J.E. (P.T.S., London. 1890), Vol. I, whole of Sutta 13

[10] *Majjhima-Nikāya, ed. cit.*, Vol. II, Sutta 101

them. Clairvoyance and clairaudience were no monopoly of any individual. Anybody could secure them by striving to become an *arahant*. While the Buddhist Path was aimed at securing this state, the Buddha did not encourage speculation, as it was bound to divert from the efforts.

Some scholars seem to believe that the Buddha's silence was absolute and that he refused to reply because of a studied apathy towards all metaphysical and cosmological issues. This view can be considered well-founded only if it can be proved that the Buddha made no exception to this rule, and consequently *never* discussed any metaphysical problem, either inside the Order or outside. Let us take up the questions one by one, and see whether this is the case, taking into account passages other than "silence" passages.

The first four questions concern the nature of the world, to wit, whether it is beginningless or not, and whether it is eternal or not. It is certainly true that the Pāli texts nowhere speak about the ultimate origin of the world, nor do they have a creation myth. However, there is no reason to think that creation is the only cosmological issue. Though he ignored the ultimate origins, the Buddha sees no harm in divulging the steps through which the world has reached its present state. "Now there comes a time, friends," he is reported to have declared, "when sooner or later, after the lapse of a long epoch, the world is dissolved and evolved. When this takes place, beings have mostly been born in the World of Radiance."[11] The various stages of development then follow. The manifest inadequacy of this theory has nothing to do with the attitude underlying it. Had the reason for the Buddha's silence really been his dislike or contempt for cosmology as such, we should expect to hear words like, "Whether the world as it is came to be like this through these steps or whether it did not, the fact of misery remains, for the eradication of which I preach." It can easily be seen that the knowledge of the steps of evolution would in no way be more useful or useless from the point of view of saving knowledge than knowledge about the beginning or end of the world would have been. One who is critical of the latter for its "fruitlessness" is hardly likely to be enamoured of the former.

PRATAP CHANDRA

(To be concluded)

---

[11] *Dialogues of the Buddha* (Trs. of *Dīgha-Nikāya* by RHYS DAVIDS, T.W., and C.A.F., (Luzac, London. 1957 reprint), Vol. III, p. 26. Cf. also p. 30 of Vol. I, and the whole of *Agganna-Sutta* (27) of *Dīgha* for the Buddhist approach to cosmology.

BRIAN G. COOPER

Master Eckhart: Mystic

[Mr. Brian G. Cooper, M.A., B.LITT., Lecturer in Liberal Studies, Lanchester College of Technology, Coventry, is well known to our readers by his frequent contributions to THE ARYAN PATH. In this article he writes of the life and basic ideas of one of the most significant members of the brotherhood of Christian mystics. The article is illustrated with many impressive passages from Master Eckhart himself. Eckhart was one of those spiritual geniuses who elevate a religion by the depth of their insight and the transcendent quality of their perceptions.—ED.]

IN THE PRESENT CONTEXT of East-West encounter, the West is beginning to take seriously the religions of the Orient, particularly their mystical treasures. If Western Man can approach this task of understanding with due humility, and a proper unwillingness to substitute any superficial syncretism for the more daunting yet more rewarding quest of patient dialogue, benefit must result. Yet the spiritual intercourse between Orient and Occident must not be one-way. The West has its treasures of the soul to be shared. This is even true for the realm of man's mystical experience. While certainly within Western Catholic and Protestant Christianity (I deliberately exclude Orthodoxy) mysticism has not played so dominant a role as in the great religions of the East, a strong tradition exists, the sharing of which will be of value in itself and further underline the fundamental oneness of humanity's spiritual pilgrimage under differing cultural forms.

A principal figure in the Christian mystical tradition is Master Eckhart (*circa* 1260–*circa* 1327).[1] Born of noble parentage at Hochheim, near Gotha in medieval Germany, he early joined the Dominican monastery at Erfurt, going on to complete his theological and philosophical studies at St. Jacques in Paris. A brilliant scholar and devout churchman, he soon proved himself an able administrator: in 1304 he was appointed provincial minister of his order in Saxony and in 1307 became Vicar-General of Bohemia. Yet pre-eminently his gifts as a teacher of young monks and nuns, and as a preacher, were outstanding. The year 1311 saw him teaching in the heady intellectual atmosphere of Paris, holding the chair of theology; during 1314–20, years of preaching and lecturing at Strasbourg and Cologne, his reputation was firmly established as an eminent religious

[1] For Eckhart, see: J. M. CLARK: *The Great German Mystics* (Oxford. 1949) and *Meister Eckhart* (London. 1957); E. UNDERHILL: *Mediaeval Mysticism.* (Cambridge. 1932); J. QUINT: *Meister Eckhart, Deutsche Predigten und Traktate* (Munich. 1955); O. KARRER: *Meister Eckhart, Das System seiner religiosen Lehre und Lebensweisheit* (Munich. 1926); J. ANCELET-HUSTACHE: *Master Eckhart and the Rhineland Mystics* (English Trs. by H. GRAEF, London. 1957).

thinker and Germany's most popular preacher. He advised Boniface VIII in his historic struggle with Philip Augustus. Of the final decade of his life we have but fragmentary glimpses, but suddenly in 1326 we see him summoned to appear before the Archbishop of Cologne on a heresy charge, and vigorously defending his innocence in an appeal to Pope John XXII. In 1327 Eckhart declared his orthodoxy at Cologne, and may have attended during proceedings at Avignon; he died not long after. In 1329 a papal bull condemned twenty-eight of his propositions and thus reflected the ecclesiastical establishment's inability to distinguish between forms of words and the sublime mystical realities so inadequately expressed through them. Alas, the papal censure diminished the circulation of Eckhart's works and most became lost for ever.

Eckhart marked one of the most glorious flowerings of medieval Christian mysticism. His experience sets him among the universal community of the world's great mystics; but he was none the less in the central Christian tradition, observing the worship and sacraments of Catholicism and the personal discipline of a monastic, all focused on the person of the mystic Christ. He stands in an honoured line commencing at the Gospel of St. John and the Pauline Epistles, going through the neo-Platonism of the Hellenistic world and the mystical elements in St. Augustine, Boethius, and the Pseudo-Dionysius, and bubbling up from the early twelfth century onwards in so many forms of Christian devotion and saintly expression: Bernard of Clairvaux; Hildegard of Bingen; Francis of Assisi; Mechtild of Magdeburg, authoress of *The Light of the Godhead*; and St. Gertrude, writer of *The Messenger of Divine Love*. Eckhart was no isolated figure; his disciples included Johannes Tauler (1300–61), Heinrich Suso (1300–65), and Johannes van Ruysbroeck (1293–1381); but he stands head and shoulders above forebears and successors alike. For philosophy and theology, he had drunk deeply from the fountains of Aristotle, Augustine, Aquinas, as well as Arab and Jewish sources; his learning did not end with the boundaries of medieval Christendom; yet from his own contemplation and dedication to the mystic way, he made a major original contribution, setting his mark on the pattern of Christian mysticism since.

His works have come down to us incompletely in Latin and German.[2] The full extent of his work is unknown. *Opus Tripartitum*, the full statement of his theological and mystical system, survives but in part; the nature of the Godhead as pure Being is a key theme. *Spiritual Instructions* records informal conversations and teaching at Erfurt. For Queen

[2] J. QUINT: *Meister Eckhart: die deutschen und lateinischen werke* (in process of publication in Germany since 1936) offers the full text of Eckhart's known works; ANCELET-HUSTACHE: *op. cit.*, contains useful lengthy extracts.

Agnes of Hungary Eckhart wrote *The Book of Divine Consolation,* in the Boethian tradition of works of comfort. Various sermons and commentaries are also extant.

In reading Eckhart's understanding of God, being, love, and the soul we breathe the pure air of mystical perception. God is being, is very Being itself, the total fullness of Being. To speak of God at all is to limit Him by human categories and earthly descriptions; so Eckhart speaks of God as "nothing," for His existence is fuller than that of any created being. The most important statement, indeed the only essentially meaningful one to be made, about God is that *He is.* The creaturely realm of the world is as nothing in comparison to the totality of the Divine. Yet in the power of God-given grace the creature, man, can aspire to Oneness with the Godhead itself, as the soul rejoins its eternal source.

For Eckhart, in the central Christian tradition, the mystical experience meant also the birth of the Son in the soul of man. The Godhead is pure Being, and is distinct from the active God; both are best described in negatives:

> God and the Godhead are as different from each other as heaven is from earth ... God works, the Godhead does not work, for It has nothing to work ... God differs from the Godhead by working and non-working.[3]
>
> God is without name, for no one can say or understand anything of Him ... if I say "God is good," this is not true. I am good, but God is not good ... You must love Him as He is: neither God nor spirit, nor person, nor image; rather the One without mixture, pure and luminous. ...[4]

Yet this God is immanent, always at hand; yet man must strive to cultivate his awareness of the divine in the midst.

> The man who is in the right way has God truly with him. Now if he has God in very truth, he has him in all places, in the road and when he is in somebody's company as well as in church or in the desert or in his cell ... Man should seize God in all things and train his mind to have God always present in his intelligence and in his striving and in his love.[5]

Man must express his love of God by responding to the temporal needs of men around him, but must himself also cultivate detachment from temporal needs. By such detachment Oneness is developed, and man grows towards that divine love which embraces all and to which all must eventually return.

> Even if a man were in a rapture like St. Paul, and knew a sick man who needed some soup from him, I should think it far better you left the rapture for love and would serve the needy man in greater love.[6]

---

[3] Sermon: *"Nolite timere eos,"* in ANCELET-HUSTACHE: *op. cit.*, pp. 54-55

[4] Sermon: *"Renovamini spiritu mentis vestrae," ibid.*, p. 55

[5] "Spiritual Instructions," *ibid.*, pp. 77-78

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 79

> We ... should have all things as if they were lent to us and not given, without any personal property, whether it be body or soul, senses, faculties, external possessions or honour, friends, relatives, house, home and all things ... If we keep ourselves detached from the things that are outside us, God will give us in return all that is in heaven.[7]
>
> Through creation God addresses, counsels and orders all creatures, by the very fact that he has created them, to follow him, to make him their end, to return quickly to him, the cause of all their being ... the nature of the creature wants to love God more than itself ... The origin and the end, the good and the end are identical.[8]

All creation is united in the Godhead, and man can fully partake of this divine union. The soul reaches out towards God to receive Him and be received by Him in joy and fulfilment, as preoccupation with the transient gives way to total preoccupation with the eternal.

> The more perfect and pure the powers of the soul, the more perfectly and fully they take in what they grasp, and the more they receive, the greater joy they will feel, the more they will become one with what they take in, so much so that the highest power of the soul which is stripped of all things and has nothing in common with anything, will receive no less than God himself in the breadth and fullness of his being.[9]

By perfecting his way towards such unity man becomes transformed closer and closer to the divine image: for Eckhart this meant the perfection of partaking in the Mystic Body of the Christ:

> All creatures seek the One, even the lowest creatures seek the One, and the highest find the One; drawn and transformed above their nature, they seek the one in the One, the One in himself. Therefore probably the Son will say: In the Godhead, Son in the Father, where I am there shall be he who serves me, who follows me, who comes to me.[10]

Master Eckhart was undoubtedly a spiritual genius. Yet he seems to have lacked some of those characteristics normally associated with mystics. Visions, effusions of personal feeling, and that intensity of pious desire typical of St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross and usually described as "nuptial" mysticism, are absent from Eckhart's writings. An austerity, a sparseness, an economy of statement, a sense of restraint and discretion, characterize their tone. Reason was among the soul's tutors for Eckhart, and a calmness of quiet reason pervades his spiritual utterances. He could shock and stir his congregations — one of his sermons is entitled *Adolescens, tibi dico: surge!* (Youth, I say to you, arise), words of Christ re-

---

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 86 [8] In "*Johannem*," *ibid.*, p. 59
[9] *The Book of Divine Consolation*, *ibid.*, pp. 93-94
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 97

given in strong challenge to zealous young monks. Yet perhaps he felt that to personalize the mystic way in public would be to draw aside the veils of the intimately divine, and to reduce in grandeur that universal which paradoxically, in the divine economy, each man must ultimately discover for himself.

Eckhart was no deliberate rebel against the ecclesiastical establishment of his day. Certainly he expressed his view that fasting, pilgrimages, good works and personal austerities were all valueless unless the heart was turned towards God, but such had always been the view of Christian orthodoxy, though often forgotten in times of ritualism and corruption in the Church. Certainly, too, he venerated the sacraments. The re-enactment of Christ's Last Supper contained for him levels of meaning highly charged with mysticism:

> A further meaning of the Last Supper is this: Before evening comes there must be a morning and a noon. The divine Light rises in the soul and produces a morning, and in this Light the soul mounts up into a breadth and a height, into noon: then follows evening ... Evening comes when the light disappears; when the whole world falls away from the soul, then it is evening, then the soul finds rest.[11]

Why, then, was he charged with heresy? Eckhart lived in no isolated world of pietistic unrealities. He was responsible for the Dominican province stretching from the Netherlands to Prague, regularly visiting on foot the fifty monasteries of friars and nine convents of nuns under his charge. He was fully in touch with the everyday issues of the Church. At a time of political conflict in Germany, antagonism between Pope and Emperor, and the appearance of many popular heretical movements, such as the Beghards, so important an ecclesiastic as Eckhart could hardly hope to stand outside the Church's internecine quarrels. His mystical teachings made him an easy prey, for the persecuted Beghards asserted the identity of the soul with God in contemplation, and a superficial reader of Eckhart could say the Master proclaimed the same. (Of course, Eckhart never affirmed the totally un-Christian notion that the soul is the same as God, or becomes God.) Politically, the attack on Eckhart was an assault by archepiscopal power on the independency and vast influence of the Dominican Order. He always confounded his critics with theological argument, yet found himself dragged deeper into a quagmire of sordid ecclesiastical intrigue. Most of the details of these events are lost to us, but we know that to end the whole messy business, Eckhart made a public affirmation of orthodoxy at Cologne's Dominical church on 13 February 1327.

---

[11] Sermon: *"Homo quidam fecit cenam magnam," ibid.*, p. 113

Eckhart's spiritual genius is doubly remarkable when we comprehend that he was no recluse but living fully in the world for the service of others. The brilliance of his unique mysticism shines out with redoubled brightness when set against the dark corruption afflicting much of the Western Christendom of his day, from which he personally suffered in his final years. He profoundly influenced all Christian mysticism. He holds a honoured place in Europe's spiritual heritage — but must belong to the world.

BRIAN G. COOPER

Most men in the course of their lives have known such Platonic hours of initiation, when the sense of beauty has risen from a pleasant feeling to a passion, and an element of strangeness and terror has been mingled with their joy. In those hours the world has seemed charged with a new vitality; with a splendour which does not belong to it but is poured through it, as light through a coloured window, grace through a sacrament, from that Perfect Beauty which "shines in company with the celestial forms" beyond the pale of appearance. In such moods of heightened consciousness each blade of grass seems fierce with meaning, and becomes a well of wondrous light: a "little emerald set in the City of God." The seeing self is indeed an initiate thrust suddenly into the sanctuary of the mysteries: and feels the "old awe and amazement" with which man encounters the Real.

—EVELYN UNDERHILL

DAVID W. ROBSON

The Inner Light in the Experience of Quakers

[We are glad to welcome to our pages Mr. David W. Robson. Educated at Quaker schools and at Manchester University, Mr. Robson has spent a number of years in social service in South Wales. For two years he was Warden of the Quaker International Centre, Paris. At present he is a lecturer in the History and Principles of Quakerism at Woodbrooke College, Birmingham.

In this article he traces the development of the important Quaker concept of guidance by the Inner Light and examines the related attitudes sympathetically and candidly.—ED.]

... nothing is comprehensible except through its history.

—TEILHARD DE CHARDIN[1]

BUT this is absurd! Quakers undoubtedly have a history, but the divine Light does not. The essence of the divine lies in its unchanging timelessness. Divine Being is that which, by definition, transcends human comprehension; and yet man has always struggled to find words to express his deepest thoughts. But he can never feel satisfied that his words convey to another the reality that he has experienced. Certainty about God has always been of a different kind, as of daylight dissipating the darkness of night. This Light has a given quality that carries the assent of the mind, but in a much larger conviction of truth that involves the whole being. We cannot help feeling that the truth about God is not so much discovered as disclosed. God himself initiates his self-revelation; and this implies a beginning and a process which is also history. This essay can be no more than a glance at the history of the Quakers, who represent a tiny fragment of the divine-human dialogue; and it is only one man's interpretation of its significance.

George Fox, the founder of Quakerism, was a simple country boy with little formal education; he could read, but wrote only with difficulty. Although he possessed a small library of books when he died, he grew up with one, the Bible. This book he read constantly, day by day, year by year; his language is so coloured by it that it is hard to tell sometimes whether he is consciously making Biblical allusions, or whether he simply had no other words to express his thoughts. His friends averred that, if the Bible were lost, George would have no difficulty in re-writing it from memory. There can be no doubt at all that Fox's mind was educated by the priests and prophets of Israel, by Jesus in his recorded teaching, and by the first apostles in their reflective writings. The same is basically

[1] TEILHARD DE CHARDIN: *The Future of Man* (Fontana), p. 13

true of all the first-and-second-generation Quakers.

George Fox grew up in all the strife and turmoil of a civil war. There was the actual fighting between the armies of King and Parliament; but there was a no less bitter ideological civil war within the ranks of Christians. Religion and politics were inextricably mixed. Bishops were oppressive officers of the Crown; and, when they fell, the King's head soon followed. The Presbyterians would have liked a church-state on the model of Geneva, no less harsh or intolerant. The battle of words raged furiously, the serious issue lost in a tempest of denunciation and heated polemic, a ceaseless ebb and flow of noisy notions, theories, doctrines. Where was the truth in all this? Where could a man stand with certainty? It was in this confusion of mind that young George roamed the countryside, questioning professors or alone with his Bible, year after year seeking a clear answer to his questions. When at last, at the point of despair, the answer came, he heard a voice that said: "There is one, even Christ Jesus, that can speak to thy condition."[2] And a great flood of light cleared his mind of all shadows of doubt and uncertainty; now he could see the hidden purpose of things, and how, in spite of all appearances, God was triumphantly at work in the hearts of men.

Anyone reading the early pages of Fox's journal must surely have this sense of a great light breaking in, an overwhelmingly full and rich experience of the life and power and love of God. This was the very power that created the universe, the same light that shone in the face of Jesus Christ, the unchangeable truth, the Word that was from the beginning, the paradisal experience of the infinite love of God. The essence of this experience is a sense of personal encounter; it was a voice that he heard, and light is not mentioned. A voice more than anything conveys the reality of person-to-person relationship. He had known Jesus all his life as a story-book character; now he had met the Christ. It was a resurrection experience. All I am concerned to show is that the reality he experienced was too rich to be expressed by a single word "Light"; in fact words pour from him in a great stream, confident, vigorous, emphatic words all stretched to the limit of their meaning. Fox is the outdoor preacher with strong lungs; his language is graphic and imprecise, colourful and frequently inconsistent. He is the prophet with a fire in his belly, sounding the Day of the Lord. A few examples must suffice:

> I saw also that there was an ocean of darkness and death, but an infinite ocean of light and love, which flowed over the ocean of darkness. And in that also I saw the infinite love of God; and I had great openings.[3]

---

[2] GEORGE FOX: *Journal*, ed. by NICKALLS (Cambridge University Press), p. 11

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 19

> I had been brought through the very ocean of darkness and death, and though the power and over the power of Satan, by the eternal glorious power of Christ ... I had been in spiritual Babylon, Sodom, Egypt, and the grave; but by the eternal power of God I was come out of it, and was brought over it and the power of it, into the power of Christ.[4]
>
> Now was I come up in spirit through the flaming sword into the paradise of God. All things were new, and all the creation gave another smell unto me than before, beyond what words can utter.[5]
>
> Now the Lord God hath opened to me by his invisible power how that every man was enlightened by the divine light of Christ; and I saw it shine through all ... This I saw in the pure openings of the Light without the help of any man. ...[6]
>
> Now I was sent to turn people from darkness to the light that they might receive Christ Jesus, for to as many as should receive him in his light, I saw that he would give power to become the sons of God.[7]

It is obvious that in trying to find words to express his experience George Fox draws heavily on the language of the Fourth Gospel. The reality that he had come to know was the Word that was in the beginning, and by which all things were made; the Word was light, the true light that lighteth every man; it was also Life, in fact the life-giving power to become the sons of God; it was nourishment and refreshment; it was Truth, and the Way to all truth; in a word Christ. However, one verse he makes little use of, viz: "And the Word was made flesh. ..."[8] This is the shocking originality of St. John, that took Augustine by surprise; and many of us lesser men find it hard to accept that Light has history. Here we are up against the mystery of words. The richness of experience may give the mystic or the poet great freedom in the use of words, and he may give them a fullness of meaning greater than is customary. But, in the ordinary way, the accepted meanings of words control and limit the thoughts they are used to express, and sometimes they impose their own logic upon us. Thus Fox was carried away by the intoxication of his inward experience; compared with the superficiality of much contemporary religious observance, his was the real kernel; the outward forms were the mere husk. It is a short step to saying that only the inward is spiritual; and thence, that the outward can only be earthy, and therefore worthless. So we see that the Quakers, in rediscovering one essential truth, overlooked its equally essential counterpart. Indwelling and incarnation are two facets of the same truth. To set them in opposition and make a dualism of inward and outward, is to set one's feet upon a very

---

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 21 [5] *Ibid.*, p. 27 [6] *Ibid.*, p. 33
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 34 [8] John 1. 14 (A.V.)

slippery slope.[9]

During his imprisonment at Launceston in Cornwall, George Fox wrote a general epistle to Friends, exhorting them to be faithful in their witness, and urging them "... to walk cheerfully over the world, answering that of God in everyone."[10] This memorable phrase, "that of God in everyone" has been discussed by Quakers on and off for three centuries, and various interpretations have been put upon it. Not unnaturally many have taken this to mean that each man had a little bit of light in him, like a candle in a lantern, and that this was sufficient to guide his steps. This concept of an individual light, and the natural corollary that my light is as good as yours, are obviously likely to lead to factions and parties, and did in fact produce a number of disputes and even small separations that rocked the small boat of Quakerism dangerously in its formative years. Where this emphasis is pushed to extremes, the consequence is Ranterism, the abandonment of any ethical compulsion or corporate discipline. However, in this crisis, Fox's common sense and spiritual authority prevailed, and the general body of Quakers accepted his clear insight that the Light was none other than the Light of Christ, from which two things followed. Firstly, that this pure Light enables one to see what is evil, and walking in the Light one is able to overcome it. "Mind that which is pure" is Fox's constant exhortation to Friends. Secondly, the Light is one and unchangeable, and therefore leads into unity; where there is no unity there is no light.

In the heat of contemporary controversy, the Quaker doctrine of the Inward Light was vigorously challenged by both Anglican and Presbyterian divines. The tendency in all such debate is to narrow the issues, mark out positions, and to defend them in language ever more extreme. All the early Quaker ministers engaged in this kind of non-stop polemic, both in public debate and in the exchange of controversial literature. However, it was left to Robert Barclay to elaborate a coherent Quaker theology. This young Scot, brought up as a Calvinist, was sent for training to a Catholic college in Paris, where he received a thorough grounding in scholastic theology. Converted to Quakerism on his return, he eagerly set about refuting what seemed to him the superstitions of the Catholic faith, and the gross errors of the Westminster Confession. His *Apology for the True Christian Divinity* seeks to show that, so far from being heretical, Quaker doctrines are really the beliefs of the primitive Church, placing, as it did, great reliance upon the Holy Spirit, and that they are fully attested by the Scriptures. The core of the work presents

[9] For a full discussion of this question see: MAURICE A. CREASEY: *"Inward" and "Outward": A Study in Early Quaker Language* (Friends Historical Society. 1962)

[10] GEORGE FOX: *Journal*, p. 263

the Light in a double aspect. In the first place, the only true knowledge of God is by "immediate" revelation, by which he means the inward and unmediated experience of the Light of Christ; and, in the second, this Light of Christ at work in the heart is the effectual and universal means of grace to salvation. And by universal he means that it is for all men, in all ages, and in all places, whether they have heard of Jesus or not; where the history is known it is of course an advantage, but it is not to be considered essential. It follows from this central affirmation that worship is an inward spiritual communion where all are gathered in a powerful unity in the Light; that ministers are inwardly moved, and the hearers inwardly reached by words that are given by immediate prompting; that this Light gives a clear vision of sin, and the power to conquer it, so that as the believer walks in the Light he grows towards a real perfection where he is no longer a slave to sin.

In the eighteenth century a perceptible change came over the religious life of England in which the Quakers shared. People were weary of "enthusiasm" and fanaticism in religion; after thirty years of persecution Friends welcomed the Toleration Act of 1689, and were glad to settle for a quiet life. Light had become so predominantly the Quaker symbol that the expected experience came to be limited to that which seemed proper to the qualities of light. All connection with history was severed; it was an impersonal, universal, mystical, and unpredictable Light requiring the abasement and purification of the creature, the emptying of all trace of self, of thought, or of will. Paradoxically, of course, this led to an intense preoccupation with one's anterior state, self-examination and self-analysis in voluminous journals, and a complete withdrawal from the world to achieve holiness and perfection through minute attention to the requirements of Quaker discipline in matters of language, dress, and strictness of behaviour. The zeal to preach to and convert the whole world had given way to the mini-ideal of a holy remnant of ever diminishing numbers, wrapped in sterile and uninspired silence. From this blind alley the Inner Light as they understood it was incapable of rescuing them.

The dangers of quietism are clear enough. But if the eighteenth-century Quakers were saved from death by quiet extinction, it is because they were quickened into life by the sheer vigour of the evangelical revival. Here once again was missionary zeal and fervour, the rediscovery of Christ as a personal saviour. But the language was all different, and to many objectionable. Yet the debate was invigorating, and the radical re-examination of belief wholly beneficial. The bitterness of some of the controversy and the separations that occurred were unfortunate, but on the whole life is better than death. Other external pressures were the campaign for the abolition of slavery, the impact of war, and the great

increase of poverty and crime, all of which forced men to relate their religion to the grim facts of human need. A further challenge in the realm of thought came with Darwin's *Origin of Species,* and the work of scholars in the critical study of the Bible. At first sight, science seemed to have struck a mortal blow at religion, and there was much alarm and despondency. In the recovery of faith that all these external pressures brought about, the evangelicals had very little use for the Inner Light; the scheme of salvation was clearly mapped out, and doctrinal orthodoxy was of paramount importance. Those who reacted against evangelicalism moved gradually away from the quietist concept, to something more akin to Neo-Platonism, in which the Light was conceived as a divinely given faculty in man. This attitude made it easier to harmonize faith with the newly revealed truths of science, and also to maintain a fairly optimistic idealism. It is also probably true that the material prosperity of the Quakers militates against that gnawing spiritual hunger that normally precedes any new inward revelation.

What does all this history teach us? Surely that it is easier to miss the way than to find it. Nevertheless we should be able to learn from our mistakes. The way of private salvation, the way of escape to peace through contemplation and withdrawal from the world, is a mirage in the desert; the spectre of the starving child will haunt this generation and the next. But the light of natural goodness does not take us very far either; the milk of human kindness soon turns sour, and our strength fails. Conceptions of the Light are no substitute for the daybreak of experience. This Light, which is also Word, and Life, and Power, will not submit to sectarian containment. One cannot contain God's daylight; it is for everybody. The "imperialism" that Christians have inherited from ancient Rome is that which crucifies the Christ again and again. Jesus is every man's brother. The infinite love of God which he shows us cannot be possessed or treasured; it must be spent without measure; it must be turned into known facts of history.

DAVID W. ROBSON

That which it is the task of a human being to create is not something in some way external to himself and capable of taking on an independent existence: in reality it is himself.

—GABRIEL MARCEL

J. N. TANDON

Thomas Hardy's Philosophy of Life

[This is the first contribution to THE ARYAN PATH by Dr. J. N. Tandon, M.A., LL.B., PH.D., Associate Professor in the Department of English, Agra College, Agra. Dr. Tandon has been teaching for twenty years now and has prepared a number of editions of well-known works of English literature for the use of university students. He has also written a number of articles on literary, social, and educational subjects. In this survey of Thomas Hardy's view of life, he brings out the honesty and compassion of Hardy's portrayal of life and also its ultimate moral value. This tragic perception is of great value as showing the results of an honest vision of man without a spiritual context or the help of a divine self within or divinity inherent in the universe. Man left to confront life without such a spiritual framework may still be magnificent by virtue of courage and magnanimity but only a spiritual dimension can reconcile realism with happiness.—ED.]

CRITICS have variously labelled Hardy's philosophy as "determinism," "fatalism," "pessimism," "scepticism," "nihilism," and so on, although Hardy himself disclaimed any such high-sounding denominations for his novels. He has very clearly stated that his writings are "a series of seemings or even personal fugitive impressions." He does not select themes to enforce his opinions or to illustrate his morals. He is too great an artist to do that. He passes down the vale of life, and without an ulterior aim he notices certain facts of life. Some individuals, scenes, and incidents impress themselves upon his mind; he does not seek them, he finds them. He gives impressions rather than arguments, musings rather than views.

> A novel [he says] is an impression, not an argument. A tale-teller writes down how the things of the world strike him without any intentions whatever.
>
> I also repeat what I have often stated [he writes again, in his Preface to *Winter Words*], that no harmonious philosophy is attempted in these pages — or in any bygone pages of mine, for that matter.

Like every other great artist, Hardy thus denies any preconceived philosophy of life that can be designated as belonging to a particular school of thought. He is an artist first and last.

Hardy observed and studied the phenomena of life not in books but in living men and women, and recorded the impressions which such a study yielded to him in his writings with a perfect sense of beauty and pathos. The remark of Channing that "every man is a volume, if you know how to read him" was wholly true for Hardy. He sees steadily with an observant eye the vast panorama of life, a bitter struggle for existence where success seldom greets the brave and the deserving. But the impres-

sions thus received are not always fugitive and fleeting; when we survey them in his writings, we see them regularly finding the same voice. They possess an inner thread of unity from the publication of his first book down to the last, each new production receiving clearer and clearer enunciation of his impressions till they become quite pronounced as "views" or "patterns of thought."

All the writings of Hardy, whether in prose or in poetry, in spite of their variety of subjects, scenes, and characters, revolve round the same theme — the tragedy of life. Hardy plunges deep into the sea of life and gets at the stern truth that "happiness is but the occasional episode in a general drama of pain." Life is something more to be endured than enjoyed. It has little beauty, joy, and goodness. For the most part it is a struggle where the most virtuous may suffer. It is a battlefield where man, a little puny creature, is pitted against the gigantic forces of Fate, God, Nature, Chance, Society, either singly or all put together, and where his moments of triumph are very insignificant and short-lived. It is a scene of much fretting, vexation, bustle, and confusion, much froth and fury, but signifying nothing. Death and disease, discord and strife, ruin and devastation stalk everywhere. Laws of Nature and rules of society are in conflict; the heart of man is the arena where great forces ranged on opposite sides wage a titanic war. The beast and the god in him are ever in conflict. Men mostly mean well but do ill; the good that they would do, they do not do, and the evil that they would not do, they do. Something more powerful than they thwarts their plans, and they come to naught. All have to suffer in the drama of this life. In the words of Gray,

> To each his sufferings; all are men,
> Condemned alike to groan;
> The tender for another's pain,
> The unfeeling for his own.

The environment is too strong for men, pigmy beings fighting giant circumstances. Men come in this world unconsulted, and with tainted lives, inherited tendencies, they are thrown in the midst of an environment which they did not create and for which they could not be responsible, which crushes their noble aspirations with a cruel hand and means sure defeat even before the struggle is begun. Children suffer for the wrongs of their parents and even remote ancestors; our teeth are set on edge because our fathers have eaten sour grapes. Hardy comes to the conclusion that this world is not the best possible, as Pope would persuade us to believe; it is an imperfect world, a sorry scheme of things. To his sight Earth is but a "tainted ball," "'tis by pangs distraught and strife, and silent suffering." Here

People surge and sigh
And laughters fail, and greetings die:
Hopes dwindle; yea
Faiths waste away,
Affections and enthusiasms numb.

Men toil hard but only to find their way to the cold grave at last. All things are here "for Death's taking"; youth, beauty and love, all are subject to decay and death; beauty fades, excellences wither, love passes away. Disease stretches out its palsied hand upon us; and "where the full cheek should be," there are "incipient lines of lank flaccidity," "lymphatic pallor where the pink should glow." Happy union is hardly possible. Man and woman wander about the earth, like two halves of a perfect whole, each waiting in crass obtuseness for the "missing counterpart," and out of their maladroit search "spring anxieties, disappointments, shocks, catastrophes and passing strange destinies." Having seen what life is, men would often say with the poet:

O Life with the sad and seared face,
I weary of seeing thee,
And thy draggled cloak, and thy hobbling pace
And thy too-forced pleasantry.

Neveretheless, some of us may set their hopes on heaven, and say, "What though we suffer here, for in heaven all our sorrows will be amply compensated." But Hardy rules out such a possibility. For him there is happiness neither here nor there. He expressly declares through the mouth of Tess that "God is not in Heaven and all is wrong with the world." If God is ever somewhere, He is most probably upon the Olympus Mountains, from where He hurls in secret thunderbolts, earthquakes, and disasters upon humanity and cackles aloud as He destroys the most precious objects.

As flies to wanton boys are we to the Gods;
They kill us for their sport.

Hardy saw too much of undeserved suffering in the world to believe in a merciful God. In a very characteristic poem of his, he paints the picture of a "godhead dying downwards, brain and eyes gone first." So strong was Hardy's rejection of God that he felt that what governs and controls the universe is only a Force, sometimes called Will, more often merely Life, which is neither benevolent nor malevolent, but utterly indifferent to the feelings of man.

Hardy's philosophy is marked with a strong note of fatalism. "Character is Fate" and man possesses no such thing as free will. In Hardy's world

everything is pre-determined and none is the "architect of his fate" or the "captain of his soul." To use the famous words of Omar Khayyam,

> The Moving Finger writes, and having writ,
> Moves on; nor all thy Piety nor Wit
> Shall lure it back to cancel half a line
> Nor all thy Tears wash out a word of it.

Among several factors that account for Hardy's tragic view of life, the most significant was the social and religious context of the age in which he lived. It was a disturbing age, an age of transition, when people stood "between two worlds, one dead, the other powerless to be born." New thinkers, some rationalist, some romantic, disputed bitterly with one another as to what creed, in the light of doubts and disbeliefs that the new developments and discoveries of science had raised, should take the place of the old religious certainty. In such a situation, while some lingered in the old faith, others took refuge in the worlds of beauty conjured up by their imaginations. But there were those also who could find no such consolation for themselves, and for the first time, pessimism — conscious, considered pessimism — found expression in English literature, in the works of writers like Matthew Arnold, Fitzgerald, and Thomas Hardy.

Hardy was especially open to the melancholy implications of the new conditions of life. As a countryman, he belonged to the world that was passing. That rural England, which was sanctified for him by every tie of early sentiment, was beginning to crumble before his eyes.

> Every year he noticed that old habits were discontinued; that stories and songs were being forgotten; that families established for years in a place were leaving it. No doubt the standard of living was improving, but against any satisfaction this might bring to his moral sense was balanced his regret at the passing of what had seemed so secure.

It is significant to note that tragedy in most of his novels turns upon the conflict between the old and the new, the medieval and the modern. In every novel he tries to point out what miseries and disasters will follow from the impact of modern competitive civilization on the primitive and simple life of the old world.

> The theme of all Hardy's great novels [observes a critic] is in some degree the tragic result of the impact of this "new and strange spirit" on the lives of the Wessex men and women ... Again and again he shows us the tragic consequences that ensue from the contact of a Sergeant Troy, a Doctor Fitzpiers, or a Lucette Templeman with the unsophisticated straightforward countryfolk like Gabriel Oak, Giles Winterborne and Michael Henchard. Such relationships reveal a kind of tragic conflict between the spirits of two ages, and it is all the the more tragic because the chief actors are often unconscious of it.

Whatever Hardy may arraign, Society, Nature, God, or Fate, as responsible for human suffering, his philosophy is never depressing, never meant for moral cowards or psychic wrecks. It gives us the pathos of human existence which is too deep for tears, and it originates from a sublime and chastened reflection. It is, in fact, a reaction against that indulgent way of optimistic thinking which fails to hear the "still, sad music of humanity which is neither harsh nor grating, though of ample power to chasten and subdue." Hardy, on account of his realistic survey of bewildered humanity grouping in darkness, is compelled to be severely sarcastic of all sentimentalists who gloss over the realities of life in a mood of irresponsible gaiety. In fact, a pessimist like Hardy is surely a better reformer of society than others, because a pessimist really points out the sources of evil in modern society and intensifies the urge for social reform. Hardy's experience sees the future of humanity as one in which the zest of life will be replaced by a growing sense of resignation and indifference towards the pains and pleasures of life. People will develop, as he says, a thick crust of intellectual indifference which will enable them to withstand the shocks and sufferings to which their flesh is heir. Hardy seems to believe that people will better serve the unseen purposes of life if they develop a "well-proportioned mind," that state of mental equilibrium which accepts aches and ecstasies alike.

> A well-proportioned mind [he writes] is one which shows no particular bias; one of which we may say that it will never cause its owner to be confined as a madman, tortured as an heretic, or crucified as a blasphemer. Also on the other hand, that it will never cause him to be applauded as a prophet, revered as a priest, or exalted as a king. Its usual blessings are happiness and mediocrity.

In this way the pessimism of Hardy grows supremely elevated and austere. It points to the necessity of something akin to the Hindu philosophy or *Virakti* or *Virāga.*

In a word, Hardy's philosophy of life reminds the reader that man is still in the making and not made. He becomes tolerant of others, knowing that "we are perfect in imperfections." He comes to realize that attachment (*āsakti*) to life is the cause of much unhappiness, and death is not the "King of Terrors" as it is generally believed to be. Hardy's sound observation makes his reader aware of the common fate of humanity and teaches him to fight on for ever and always shout boldly in the midst of the greatest griefs and disasters, like Henchard: "My punishment is not greater than I can bear." Thus what saves Hardy's pessimism from being depressing is his high and noble conception of human nature. Men, no doubt, are condemned to great suffering, but at the same time

they have also been gifted with a power of moral resistance, and it is in this resistance to evil, this power of enduring the buffets and blows of Fate, with "courage never to submit or yield," that the true spirit of Hardy's philosophy lies. Like the great tragic dramas of Sophocles and Shakespeare, his novels leave the reader in no mood of disgust or depression, but rather in one of admiration for the greatness and magnificence of human passion and human courage, and of awe at the mystery of human suffering.

J. N. TANDON

The Encounter

I heard, I felt;
I did not know
The visitor who came to me.

The voice, the touch
Brought healing grace;
It was encountered mystery.

MARY CARMAN ROSE

FRANCIS H. ANGOLD

A Theosophical Approach to the Wagnerian Siegfried Idyll

[The Rev. F. H. Angold, PH.D., F.R.A.I., after his training for the Church, studied anthropology and for many years taught in schools, universities, and Adult Education programmes. He has written poems, plays, and articles for a large number of journals. Readers may remember his articles on "The Ethical Quality in Music" in THE ARYAN PATH for April 1966 and on "Schubert: The Natural Composer" in September 1967.

Though not himself a Theosophist, he calls his present interpretation of the heroic figure of Siegfried in Wagner's music-drama a Theosophical approach to the subject. This is in the sense that the Rev. Mr. Angold finds that the theme is illuminated by certain sayings of Madame Blavatsky and in the sense that a perspective of spiritual evolution for mankind seems to him the best way of understanding Wagner's inspiration.

Interested readers will find many suggestive comments in the writings of Madame Blavatsky on the symbolism of Scandinavian and Germanic myths and legends.—ED.]

SIEGFRIED is the hero of the last two dramas of the Ring cycle. The nature of this character is defined for us in a letter written by Wagner to August Roeckel in 1854:

> After his parting from Brunnhilde, Wotan is truly nothing but a departed spirit; his highest aim can only be to let things take their course, go their own gait, no longer definitely to interfere; for that reason, too, has become the "Wanderer." Take a good look at him! He resembles us to a hair; he is the sum of the Intellect of the Present, whilst Siegfried is the Man of the Future, the man we wish, the man we will, but cannot make, and the man who must create himself through our annihilation.[1]

Siegfried is one with Nature; in his person he epitomizes the triumphant glory of eternal recurrence. He is set in contrast to Wotan, the principal character in the cycle of music-dramas, *The Ring of the Nibelungs*. He is the god who rules over Valhalla, and brings on the final destruction of the gods in the last of the dramas, *The Twilight of the Gods*. Wotan serves to symbolize that which man tends to fear, the incalculable and the unknown; Siegfried on the other hand becomes the image of the Superman, that which overcomes.

Wilhelm Richard Wagner was born in 1813 and died in 1883. Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche (1844–1900) met Wagner at Basle when the composer was approaching the height of his fame. Wagner became for Nietzsche an idol, and although the former was nearly thirty years older

[1] J. CUTHBERT HADDEN: *The Operas of Wagner*, p. 203

than the latter, the influence exerted by Wagner on Nietzsche was tremendous. Later Nietzsche became the severe critic of his former master, provoking an open breach after the publication of *Parsifal*.

Nietzsche is perhaps best known for his work *Thus Spake Zarathustra* which in itself reflects not merely the thought processes of Nietzsche himself but the philosophical outlook of those whose acquaintance he made, particularly during the years 1856–64 when he was at the famous Pforta School, where Klopstock, Novalis, Fichte, and the Schlegel brothers had studied before him.

The greatest impact made upon Nietzsche apart from that of Wagner was that of Schopenhauer (1788–1860), whose book *The World as Will and Representation* was largely responsible for the development of his original thought. Nietzsche was a philologist, who perhaps never became a philosopher in the true sense of the term, but one who, owing to the influence of the composer and the philosopher, sought to clarify the theological thinking of his time.

Schopenhaeur observed that when man wants something he sets about creating it. From this he deduced that will is the cause of all things in the universe; the universe is the result of will. It is not surprising that Nietzsche, dissatisfied with the ecclesiastical definitions of God, saw in the will-to-be the transcendent sequel to a God who no longer lived.

Nietzsche paints the picture of the *Ubermensch* — the Superman — not in the sense of aggression but of overcoming, until at last man stands revealed in his true nature:

> You solitaries of today, you who have seceded from society, you shall one day be a people: from you, who have chosen out yourselves, shall a chosen people spring — and from this chosen people, the Superman.
>
> Truly, the earth shall yet become a house of healing! And already a new odour floats about it, an odour that brings health — and a new hope![2]

Herein we see the personification of the will-to-become. Man is called upon to decide:

> And this is the great noontide: it is when man stands at the middle of his course between animal and Superman and celebrates his journey to the evening as his highest hope: for it is the journey to a new morning.
>
> Then man, going under, will bless himself; for he will be going over to Superman; and the sun of his knowledge will stand at noontide. "All gods are dead: now we want the Superman to live" — let this be our last will one day at the great noontide![3]

---

[2] NIETZSCHE: *Thus Spake Zarathustra*, trs. by R. J. HOLLINGDALE (Penguin Classics, 1961), p. 103

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 204

Will is seen to be the dominating force of existence, but it is will in union or fusion with that which is. Man has no strength in isolation. This in fact is an idea expounded by the apostle Paul: "I can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth me."[4] Paul employs the term Christ, not so much for a person as for the embodiment of all power, an idea put forward by Jesus when he said: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth."[5] At the same time it is the Wagnerian concept: Wotan has become nothing but a departed spirit; but in striking contrast stands forth Siegfried, the Man of the Future, the man who must create himself.

Nietzsche was concerned not with an end but a state of being. Importance for him attached not to what is done, but to what we are. This is much the same as the Wagnerian ideal of self-identification with Nature. We learn from *Thus Spake Zarathustra* that while the God of the textbooks may be dead, the power behind the universe is vibrant with life. Nietzsche speaks of health and hope; he points towards the new day which is to dawn. This is none other than the great theme of redemption which runs all through Wagnerian music-drama, not least through the triumph of Siegfried.

Descartes (1596–1650) believed that, man being capable of conceiving of God, therefore God exists; the idea presupposes the reality. This is not so very different from the thought of Plato (427-347 B.C.), who regarded the idea as but an image of that which really is. Unfortunately, we have become accustomed to regard the term God as being self-explanatory, when in fact it is nothing more than a label. In truth every man becomes his own interpreter; God is that which we desire him to be.

In contrast to the vagueness of supposition we are confronted with the credibility of Nature, whose changing seasons reflect both the manifold nature of existence and the law of eternal recurrence. Redemption is to be found not through the performance of rite and ceremony, but through our identification with Nature as the epitome of life abundant. The incentive to truly noble living is the splendour of the unknown. Alexander Pope (1688–1744) expresses this truth when he says:

> Hope springs eternal in the human breast:
> Man never is, but always to be blest,
> The soul, uneasy, and confin'd from home,
> Rests and expatiates in a life to come.[6]

Man looks backward to a golden age that is passed, or forward to one which is to be. Man is essentially the seeker and this role has never been

---

[4] Philippians IV.13 [5] Matthew XXVIII.18

[6] POPE: *Essay on Man*, Epistle I, line 95

more graphically portrayed than in the character created by Wagner in the person of Siegfried. All religion is in essence the attempt by man to discover the way; the path to identification.

H. P. Blavatsky has said:

> There being but One Truth, man requires but one church — The Temple of God within us, walled in by matter but penetrable by anyone who can find the way; the pure in heart see God.[7]

The pure in heart,[8] are not merely the sinless, but rather those single-minded souls who determine to discover truth, wherever it is to be found. H. P. Blavatsky further tells us:

> A religion, in the true and only correct sense, is a bond uniting men together — not a particular set of dogmas and beliefs. Now Religion, *per se,* in its widest meaning is that which binds not only all Men, but also all Beings and all things in the entire Universe into one grand whole. This is our Theosophical definition of religion.[9]

If religion serves to unify, we are compelled to recognize the truth that much deemed to be religious is in fact the contrary. The Universe is made up of a vast number of finely tuned and skilfully integrated parts. Nothing is superfluous, but everything is uniquely related. If one part suffers the whole becomes that much weaker, but, through the functioning of a benign providence, the weakened part, being able to draw upon the whole, is revived and kept in operation. Buddha was made conscious of this truth, and it is one that Jesus no less expounded in his teaching about the lilies of the field. It is not the eminence of a person but his state of being[10] which is of value. In the eyes of the Creator the insignificant sparrow is as valuable as the greatest potentate.[11]

Nietzsche was profoundly influenced both by Wagner and by Schopenhauer; the manner by which the composer arrived at his great conception we do not know. He has become the vehicle for the musical expression of profound truth. In the character of Siegfried we discern not merely the hero, but the Superman; he who has overcome, by becoming his true self.

Siegfried was Wagner's own favourite. He referred to him as "the most beautiful of my life's dreams."[12] The opera *Siegfried* is not merely concerned with Nature but symbolizes the union of earth with heaven, from which are to spring life and hope. The tragedy, if such it can be called, of the Ring, is the fading out of Wotan. The third act of the opera is perhaps the greatest of Wagner's achievements. It is in fact one long, impassioned love-duet. The second act has won great popularity with "the

---

[7] H. P. BLAVATSKY: *Isis Unveiled* (1877), II.635 [8] Matthew V.8
[9] H. P. BLAVATSKY: "Is Theosophy a Religion?" (1888)
[10] Matthew VI.28 [11] *Ibid.*, X.29 [12] HADDEN: *op. cit.*, p. 207

murmuring sounds of the forest, with its calling of birds and rustling of leaves," but the third act remains the great creation.

> Siegfried pierces the protecting flame, the fiery ring, and wakens Brunnhilde, the sleeping beauty. He "cults the byrny from her bosom and wakes her with a kiss!" Wonderful is the music of the awakening.
>
> Brunnhilde sings her hymn to sunlight and earth, and proclaims herself Siegfried's from the beginning. One last struggle for her maidenhood, and she yields herself. The union is made, the old order is done; the new race is to come and rule the world.[13]

The Siegfried Idyll was first performed at 7.30 on the Christmas morning of 1870 at Triebschen in a quiet villa on the shore of Lake Lucerne. It was planned to delight Cosima Wagner, daughter of Franz Liszt and now Wagner's wife and the mother of his three children, of whom the youngest, Siegfried, had been born over eighteen months earlier. Christmas Day was Cosima's birthday, and Siegfried having been born when Wagner was engaged on the third of the great cycle of music-dramas, *Der Ring des Nibelungen, Siegfried,* the Idyll composed from melodies of the opera, was designed as both a surprise for and a tribute to her whom he loved so deeply.

To say that the Idyll is exquisite is to employ a commonplace. The blending of the melodies is unique; from them flows all the poignancy of life and death. There are the changing moods of the seasons, but also, running through all the eternal recurrence, the constancy of being. The first performance given upon the stairway of the villa (which earned for it the name of *Treppenmusik,* "Staircase Music"), was a memorable occasion. Here was the union of earth with heaven, the joining of man with woman; the murmurs of the forest and the passion of desire. Wagner himself conducted this performance by two first violins, two second violins, two violas, a flute, an oboe, two clarinets, a basson, and two horns, one cello and a double bass.

This music, repeated several times during that Christmas Day, became one of the best loved of Wagner's works. In its melodies we discover not merely the hero, the destined Superman, but Siegfried who leads the world of all creation towards the light of unending day. Siegfried is the hero not in the sense of conquest, but of overcoming and thus becoming. The Universe is restored and all creation rejoices in the eternal redemption won for them.

Wagner was undoubtedly inspired by Theosophical ideas and he in turn greatly influenced Nietzsche. The Siegfried Idyll glorifies the Whole, the perfecting of the parts through union: all made One.

---

[13] *Ibid.*

The Siegfried Idyll was originally called Triebschener Idyll. It is not generally realized that its main theme is derived from the familiar horn call of Siegfried himself, merely dropping out a few notes and giving it an atmosphere of charming sweetness instead of militant defiance. An actual folk-song also appears in this composition, the lullaby, *Schlaf', mein Kind, schlaf' ein,* whose melody is strikingly similar to Handel's *He shall Feed His Flock.*[14]

The wonder of life is to be found in the realization that what is, has ever been, and will in consequence, for ever be. This is the reality of eternal recurrence. Nothing can ever be lost; all must at length attain to their true nature. The path may be smooth or rough; the way long or short; but eventually through identification with the Whole we enter upon the path of enlightenment and we know what till then we have only faintly glimpsed. In the words of Paul: "Now we see through a glass darkly; but then face to face."[15]

Wagner may have exercised a hypnotic influence over others, he may have been inconsiderate and even ruthless, but he expressed through the medium of music-drama the profound truth of redemption that we become, not by what we do, but through the realization of what we are, functional parts of a stupendous WHOLE:

> All is concentred in a life intense,
> Where not a beam, nor air, nor leaf is lost,
> But hath a part of being.[16]

FRANCIS H. ANGOLD

The heroism we recite
    Would be a daily thing
Did not ourselves the cubits warp
    For fear to be a king.

—EMILY DICKINSON

---

[14] SIGMUND SPAETH : *Stories Behind the World's Great Music* (1940), pp. 161-2

[15] I Corinthians XIII. 12

[16] BYRON : *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage*, Canto III, St. 89

PREMA PANDURANGAN

The Conquest of Anger

[Smt. Prema Pandurangan, Assistant Professor of English, Presidency College, Madras, has had a bright career as a student of English literature and Sanskrit. She is now working on a doctoral thesis on "Modern Drama" besides teaching. In this brief article she considers some of the classic comments on anger in Indian tradition and in Western literature.—ED.]

ALL RELIGIONS prescribe self-control as the remedy for the ills of life.[1] Self-control is freedom from routine; it is deliverance from hardened habit; it is the spring of creative life. Anger is the most blatant form of the loss of self-control. It is the result of helplessness. Fear is the emotion that most often seems to underlie anger.

Anger is primarily bad social form. It is seldom tolerated by company. An angry man becomes a target of ridicule even in a company of ordinary men and women. In the words of Horace, "Anger is a brief madness."

Anger is an abnormal condition of body, mind, and spirit. This three-divisional analysis of anger clarifies its diverse aspects. Anger is classified into the carnal, the mental, and the spiritual. Man is deplorable when he succumbs to anger. He loses control of his limbs, his features, and his voice. He exhibits physical forms of exhaustion such as sweat. He mouths incoherent words of blurts out vulgar unpleasant terms. His language is charged with hatred. He seldom remembers and often denies what he uttered in the fit of anger. Rudimentary anger arises from a denial of biological needs. Such anger clearly shows the affinity of man to the animal world.[2] Anger is the most fearful form of human egotism. On Buddhist analysis, it turns out to be the most unlovely expression of the frustrated desires of man. On the physical side, it inhibits the workings of the cerebral region. It non-plusses one's understanding. The proud man, too, is colourfully described by Shakespeare as an angry ape playing such fantastic tricks before high heaven as make the angels weep (*Measure for Measure,* Act. II, Sc. ii.).

It is significant that the author of the *Mahābhārata* and Gautama the Buddha speak in the same strain with almost amazingly identical words exhorting erring mankind to forswear its foolish ways and overcome anger:

> *Akrodhena jayet krodham asādhum sadhunā jayet*
> *Jayet kadaryam dānena satyenālikavādinaṁ.*
> (*Mahābhārata, "Udyogaparva,"* 38, 73, 74)

---

[1] *Sarve dharmāḥ manonigraha-lakṣaṇāntāḥ*
(All duties have self-control for their end.)

[2] *Āhāra-nidrā-bhaya-maithunañ ca, sāmānyametad paśubhirnarāṇām*

Akkodhena jine kodham asādhuṁ sādhunā jine
Jine kaderiyam dānena, saccenālikavādinam."
(*Dhammapada,* 223)

Both might be rendered by Dr. Radhakrishnan's translation of the latter:

> Let a man overcome anger by non-anger (gentleness), let him overcome evil by good, let him overcome the miser by liberality, let him overcome the liar by truth.

Anger arising out of biological needs cools down with a temporary satisfaction of desire, only to be soon reinforced. This anger is the curse of millions of us who are boorish in our instincts in spite of our civilization. There is little hope for such unregenerate men.

The second type of anger is that of the mind. Students of human nature have concluded that man's progress with the evolution of time has been marked by a scrupulous, skilful, and somewhat successful degree of hypocrisy. Most of our civilized tribes suffer from the anger of the mind. This is not very different from the earlier type. It is the same unhealthy stuff with a silken gloss of sophistication. The baser instincts of jealousy and lust are at its bottom. Man has only trained himself not to exhibit his primitive feelings to the outer world. He does not gnash his teeth or strike with his fist; he schemes. He smiles and smiles and remains a villain. The experience of this type of anger is not visible to a casual spectator. It needs a shrewd eye to note the restless mind behind the strained mock-courtesy. Anger leaves such a man no peace of mind. He tries hard not to give in to his temper, but seldom succeeds. This is the anger of the literate. They make feeble attempts to achieve aims which fall miserably short of absolute ideals. Their needs are earthly; their manners are cultured but reveal the utter lack of self-control. Anger, says the Lord in the *Bhagavad-Gītā,* is desire, and that is the hurdle to all spiritual progress.

Kāma eṣa krodha eṣa rajoguṇasamudbhavaḥ
Mahāśano mahāpāpmā viddhyenamiha vairiṇam

(This is craving, this is wrath born of the mode of passion, all-devouring and most sinful, know this to be the enemy here.)

—*Gītā,* III. 37; trs. by S. RADHAKRISHNAN

Again and again the Lord refers to the terrific nature of the triad — desire, anger, and greed — the three gateways to Hell (*Gītā,* XVI.21). These three take residence in the mind (*manas*) of man, in the senses (*indriya*) and in the reason (*buddhi*) (III.40). The Lord exhorts us to hunt them out and destroy them in order to attain spiritual well-being.

The third state of anger is the bane of the best of mankind. These are the ones who have analysed the course of anger, found its causes, detested its results and whose life is a continuous discipline to overcome it. These are the blessed who have faith in God, believe in goodness and morality. The first two states can be comprehended by all. Those of the first two need not know the third stage. This anger is a subtle one. Petty jealousies have faded at this summit. What remains is arrogance — a bit of it, yet very dangerous. This anger is born out of a temporary forgetfulness of God, a fleeting moment of personal triumph, oblivious of His Power and Glory. It may last for a moment but leaves the man in the third stage utterly dejected in his soul. He suffers a torture unknown to the men of the first two classes. He is ashamed of himself. He bows his head at the thought of God. He pities the ego which for a moment has dragged him into sinful mire. To such a man gloating over one's own attainments is synonymous with forgetting God's Glory. He believes in unquestioning obedience to God. His humility is equal to Adam's after the Sin — even pride in one's own virtues is sinful:

> Let none henceforth seek needless cause to approve
> The faith they owe; when earnestly they seek
> Such proof, conclude, they then begin to faile.
> (*Paradise Lost*, II. 1140-2)

Anger leaves such a person praying with redoubled devotion for God's pardon. His life is a series of improvements on each earlier day.

Such a man alone is capable of studying impartially anger as a human instinct. The first two types are blind in anger and remain so even after they have ceased to be angry. The third type of angry man is blind for a moment, only to be made too conscious of the consequent luminous vision. It is in the way one gives in to anger that one differs from another. The *locus classicus* on anger is the verses of Hanūmān, the peerless devotee of Śrī-Rāmā, in the great Indian epic, the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Hanūmān in a fierce mood has set fire to the towers and battlements of Lanka. For a moment, he pauses, in a state of glee, gazing at the dazzling city in flames. He realizes his mistake and repents for his lack of foresight. He sorrows at the thought of Sita's life being in danger and curses his own mad impulse in setting fire to the whole city. He deplores his lack of self-control and speaks words of matchless wisdom describing anger and what an angry man can do. Hanūmān, an exemplar of selfless devotion to the Lord, has lost his temper in a spirit of revenge against his Lord's enemy. This loss of self-control is not for a personal cause. Yet the utter humility of Hanūmān serves as a revelation to angry men of the world.

Dhanyāste puruṣaśreṣṭhāḥ ye buddhyā kopamutthitham
Nirundhanti mahātmāno dīptamagnimivāmbhasā.

(Those best among men, the great souls are blessed, who can put down their surging anger with reason as they extinguish a blazing fire with water.)

("*Sundara-Kāṇḍa*," LV. 4)

Kruddhaḥ pāpaṁ na kuryāt kaḥ kruddhaḥ hanyāt gurūnapi
Kruddhaḥ paruṣayā vācā naraḥ sādhūn adhikṣipet
Vācyāvācyam prakupito na vijānāti karhicit
Nākāryamasti kruddhasya nāvācyam vidyate kvacit

(Which angry man will not sin? He may even strike his elders, he may abuse the virtuous in foul terms; he does not use words discreetly, there is nothing forbidden in speech or deed for an angry man. (*Ibid.*, 5–7).

Sage Vālmīki instructs the irate men of the world about the futility of anger through the immortal expression of its characteristics in the words of Hanūmān:

Yah samutpatitaṁ krodham kṣamayaiva nirasyati
Yathoragastvacaṁ jīrṇāṁ sa vai puruṣa ucyate.

(*Ibid.*, 8)

(He who resolves roused anger as by forbearance the snake sloughs off its old skin — he indeed is called a man.)

Fear is effeminate and fearlessness is a sign of self-control. He who can with forbearance conquer anger is a man of fearlessness. Fear freezes our mind and destroys our morals. It is the most ignoble of human emotions. To be fearless implies a faith, a spiritual prop.

Anger is one of the formidable sins according to Hindu ethics. The striking syllogism proving the cause of man's fall is expressed by the Lord in the second chapter of *The Song Celestial*:

Dhyāyato viṣayān puṁsah sangas teṣūpajāyate
Saṅgāt samjāyate kāmaḥ kāmāt krodho'bhijāyate
Krodhād bhavati sammohaḥ sammohāt smṛtivibhramaḥ
Smṛtibhraṁśād buddhināśo buddhināśāt praṇaśyati

(v.v. 62-63)

(When a man dwells in his mind on the objects of sense, attachment to them is produced. From attachment springs desire and from desire comes anger. From anger arises bewilderment, from bewilderment loss of memory, and from loss of memory, the destruction of intelligence and from the destruction of intelligence he perishes.

—Trs. by S. RADHAKRISHNAN)

The first two types of anger lead us to this irretrievable perdition. The third class cries halt to anger only to take on a fresh struggle for the

emancipation of the spirit. The man in this stage has faith in God and seeks perfection. Anger for him is part of the dark night of the soul. It conceals the spiritual in man. It leads to the continuous struggle of the soul to chasten itself into humility, to accept ungrudgingly the absolute perfection of the Lord, to the incessant practice of self-effacement and the capacity for tolerance born out of it, and finally a longing for the peace, sweet after the long strife, of spiritual poise and perfect friendliness to all creatures.

PREMA PANDURANGAN

All emotions of hatred are bad: and therefore he who lives according to the precepts of reason will endeavour as much as possible to bring it to pass that he is not assailed by emotions of hatred, and consequently he will endeavour to prevent anyone else from suffering those emotions. But hatred is increased by reciprocated hatred, and, on the contrary, can be demolished by love in such a way that hatred is transformed into love. Therefore he who lives under the guidance of reason will endeavour to repay another's hatred, etc., with love, that is, nobleness. ...

He who wishes to revenge injuries by reciprocal hatred will live in misery. But he who endeavours to drive away hatred by means of love, fights with pleasure and confidence: he resists equally one or many men, and scarcely needs at all the help of fortune. Those whom he conquers yield joyfully, not from want of force but increase thereof. All these things follow so clearly from the definitions alone of love and intellect that there is no need for me to point them out.

—SPINOZA

New Books and Old

The Sikh Religion and Its Founder*

IF you question the man in the street in India regarding the Sikh religion and Nānak, its founder, you will probably receive the confident reply that Nānak founded an eclectic faith compounded of elements drawn mainly from Hinduism and partly from Islam; that he was a great unifier of Hindus and Muslims (*Na ko Hindu hai na ko Musalman hai*, p. 12), having travelled even to Mecca and Medina in search of truth, and that he destroyed the hateful institution of caste. These generalizations are only half-truths. We have the curious phenomenon that the religion of Nānak was purely an Indian religion; that his life is more legend than history; and that his faith is clear, simple, consistent, and beautiful.

To one who is not a Sikh, and who is a student of the history of religions, Nānak was one of the greatest religious teachers of India; but, as McLeod says, unfortunately for us, we know very little about him: "The Nānak of faith and legend can be described at great length, but the historical Nānak must remain in large measure hidden" (p. 227). His very greatness made his life a legend.

There were three distinct phases in the life of Nānak; first, the period of early childhood and manhood in Talvandi and Sultanpur; secondly a period of travel; and finally the settled existence at Kartarpur. Of the first period, we know but little; he was a *khatri* of the *bedi* subcaste, and belonged to a respectable family. Probably he was devoted to agriculture, his ancestral occupation; he had wife and children; but his extraordinariness stemmed from his ordinariness. He was not illiterate as the Arabian Prophet is believed to have been. Of his travels we know next to nothing, his pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina being merely a pious fiction. The *janam-sākhīs* and other source material differ so widely that very few facts can be taken to be established. But he undoubtedly met a number of *faqirs* and *sadhus* like other teachers of a like stature, and gained knowledge from a variety of sources.

It is when we reach the third period of Gurū Nānak's life that we pass beyond the realms of doubt and conjecture. The Teacher was then about fifty; he settled at Kartarpur; his fame had spread far and wide; he devoted himself to his worldly occupations, and never preached withdrawal or renunciation. Disciples gathered around him and drank at the fountain of wisdom and imbibed his doctrine. The combination of piety and practical activity was the chief characteristic of the Gurū. It was a piety devoid of superstition; and worldly life coupled with compassion and generosity. As McLeod, who stayed in the Punjab to complete his work, says, Nānak's life illuminates the past and explains much that exists today.

We must now turn to the teaching of Nānak.

God is One and Eternal, and there is no other.

> This Being is One. He is eternal ... He is the Creator of all things. He is immanent in His creation. He is without fear and enmity. This Being is not subject to time. He is beyond birth and death. He is Himself responsible for His own manifestation. (He is known) by the Guru's Grace.

— thus the *Mūla-Mantra*, the beginning of the *Ādi Granth* (pp. 163-4).

(1) The unity of God is stressed again and again, as in the *Koran*, "... and there is no other." The belief

---

**Gurū Nānak and the Sikh Religion.* By W. H. MCLEOD. (Clarendon; Oxford University Press, London. 259 pp. 1969. Rs. 42. 50)

in the Supreme Being involves monotheism rather than monism; for God can only be known through His creation. His three aspects, drawn from Hinduism, are not denied: "He, the One, is Himself Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and Śiva," and yet: "My Master is the One. He is the One, brother, and He alone exists." (pp. 166-7)

(2) The One is both absolute and conditioned, *nirguṇa* and *saguṇa*. By His absolute Power he created creation and thus from *nirguṇa* He became *saguṇa*. (p. 167)

(3) He is Creator of the universe.

> For countless aeons there was undivided darkness. There was neither earth nor heavens, but only the Infinite Order of God [*Hukam*, from Arabic, *hukm*, but in a different sense]. (p. 168)

(4), (5) He is also the Sustainer and the Destroyer, Viṣṇu and Śiva. "True Creator, True Sustainer; and known as the True One" (p. 169). Thus God for Gurū Nānak is a participant in the life of the universe.

(6) He is possessed of Sovereignty. "Thou art absolute and whatever is Thy will comes to pass." (p. 170)

(7) He is eternal. "He the true Lord is eternally true. He is and will be ... unlike His creation He will not pass away." He is thus *avināśi*, eternal; for He is both *anādi*, without beginning, and *akāl*, timeless. (p. 171)

(8) He is Formless. Possessed of all the above attributes, He is *Nirānkār*, "Thou the eternally unchanging Formless One." (p. 172)

(9) He is ineffable. "Beyond understanding, infinite, unreachable, beyond perception, free from death and *karma* ... Thou, the Ultimate Truth, to Thee I sacrifice myself" — says the Gurū. (p. 173)

(10) God is Immanent. God is Infinite and so ultimately beyond understanding, but this does not necessarily mean that He is wholly unknowable; God has a particular abode in the human heart. Like the God of the *Koran*, He is nearer than the jugular vein (*Koran*). It is through the Divine Order, *Hukam*, that He is known to man.

(11) The Divine Initiative is necessary for human salvation: "Nānak, the True King Himself unites the believer with Himself" (p. 175). Man's effort combined with God's Grace leads to salvation: "Nānak, all we receive is by the grace of the Beneficent One." (p. 176)

(12) The greatness and glory of God are unattainable except by the true seeker: "... everyone speaks of it, but only by seeing Thee can one know the immensity of Thy greatness" (p. 176). Thus Nānak's faith implies a mystic union by human endeavour coupled with divine Grace.

We now come to the nature of human beings. Man by nature is unregenerate; he must therefore cleanse his *man*. Now *man* comes from the *manas* of the *Ṛgveda*, the Upaniṣads, and the Vedānta. It covers both "mind" and "heart." This *man* is beset with *haumai* which is allied to sin, the tendency to evil. *Haumai* may be rendered as "ego," "pride," or "sin," but Nānak uses *haumai* in a special sense. In *haumai* "[man] fails to perceive the true nature of salvation. In *haumai* there is *māyā* and its shadow (... doubt)." But: "He who discerns the nature of the Divine Order (*Hukam*) discerns his *haumai* also."

Thus the person who fails to discern the Divine Order is enmeshed in his *haumai* and is known as *manmukh;* but the *Gurumukh* hears the *Śabad* (Word) and obeys the Guru's word and sees the Light.

Having understood the nature of God and man's imperfection, we must see how God expresses Himself and brings salvation to man. This is done in the Sikh religion by the belief in the Word (*Śabad*). God's direction comes from His Word expressed through the Gurū: "Nānak, the Lord, the true Creator, is known by means of the Word, *Śabad*!" The word of the Gurū becomes God's Word, *gurūpadeś*. The Word is the

Inner Conviction; its outward expression is Name of the Lord, *Nām*. But the Name can only be pronounced by the true in heart: "By means of the Word one enshrines the Name in one's heart" (p. 195). The Word is the medium of communication; the Name is the object of communication. The true channel through which man can achieve *Śabad* and *Nām* is the Teacher, the Gurū, who then becomes the Paraclete.

> Without the *Gurū* there can be no *bhakti*, no love;
> Without the *Gurū* there is no access to the company of the *sants*:
> Without the *Gurū* one blindly engages in futile endeavour;
> But with the *Gurū* one's *man* is purified. ... (p. 197)

The Gurū was Nānak in the first instance; then the Ten Gurūs, and finally the power of the Gurū resides absolutely in the sacred revelation, the *Ādi Granth*. "The Gurū is accordingly God; the Gurū is the Voice of God, and the Gurū is the Word, the Truth of God." (p. 199)

Śabad, Nām, and Gurū all point to the *Hukam,* the Divine Order: "Nānak, thus it is written: Submit to the *Hukam,* walk in its way." (p. 200)

True religion is interior; external acts are not enough:

> Hear me, pandit, you who put your trust in all your religious works. The work which brings peace is meditation upon spiritual reality. You stand up and recite the Śāstras and the Vedas, but your actions are those of the world. Inner filth and evil are not cleansed by hypocrisy. You are like a spider caught upside down (in the web you have spun)! (p. 208)

This is exactly what Ghazali teaches. Outward acts, however meticulously performed, are of no avail, until the heart and mind are purified by the true faith. For that, loving devotion is required, and true prayer (*nām simaran*).

When the truth is grasped the ascent commences and it has five stages, very reminiscent of the fourfold path of the Sufis, *Shariat, Tariqat, Ma'rifat,* and *Haqiqat* (the Law, the Path, the Knowledge, the Truth). These are the five *khaṇḍs — Dharam Khaṇḍ, Gian Khaṇḍ, Saram Khaṇḍ, Karam Khaṇḍ, Sach Khaṇḍ.*

The first stage, *dharam,* involves cause and effect, reward and punishment; the second, *Gian* (*jñāna*), involves understanding; the third, *saram,* involves "surrender"; the fourth, *karam,* involves fulfilment; and finally the *Sach Khaṇḍ* is the ultimate goal, salvation. The Gurū explains it by saying:

> If God shows favour, one meditates on Him. The *ātmā* is dissolved and is absorbed (in God). (The) *ātmā* becomes one with *Paramātmā* and inner duality dies within. (p. 224).

This is a simple statement enshrining the message of the Upaniṣads, the Buddha, Rumi, and Ghazali, and the innumerable illuminated souls which have united with eternity.

The book is the work of a scholar who has gone exhaustively to the original sources such as the *janam-sākhīs* and other documents of primary importance, including the *Ādi Granth*. The translations are his own. This is a revised version of the author's doctoral thesis and has received the consideration of a galaxy of scholars representing various faiths and disciplines. The book has been printed and published by the leading house in England. For long it will remain a standard work of reference on the life and teaching of Gurū Nānak, one of the most illustrious sons of India.

A. A. A. FYZEE

In the Tracks of Buddhism. By F. SCHUON. Trs. from the French by MARCO PALLIS. (George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London. 168 pp. 1968. 28*s*.)

As is evident from the title, this is not a systematic exposition of the doctrines of Buddhism. Marco Pallis, in his Translator's Preface, describes its method:

> [The author handles] his subject on free lines, focusing attention on whatever will serve to illustrate the point of the moment; his treatment of the subject in question has something of the character of a series of discontinuous (though invisibly connected) tableaux; the form of the title chosen for this book is in keeping with this technique.

This is an understatement. The very titles of the chapters are so disjointed that it is difficult to see any logical nexus between them.

The book is divided into three Parts: "In the Tracks of Buddhism," "Buddhism's Ally in Japan," and "Vistas of the Mahāyāna." So far as the first part is concerned, it is difficult to make out what exactly the writer is attempting to say and what relevance it has to Buddhism. Here is an extract from an early chapter, "Cosmological and Eschatological Viewpoints." It is difficult to make sense of these involved sentences:

> From a monotheistic and Western point of view it may seem strange that Buddhism, as also Hinduism, only takes very scant account of the possibility of obtaining what the Confucio-Taoist tradition calls the state of "longevity." The explanation lies in the fact that the first named perspectives, being metaphysically and not "humanistically" orientated, envisage Deliverance outside any and every world; they therefore start out from the alternative "Existence — Deliverance" and not, as in the case of the Judeo-European view of things, from the alternative "damnation — salvation." In other words, the Far Eastern and Indian perspectives have no presumptive interest in individualistic solutions; they do not wish to compromise Deliverance by lingering over solutions that still appertain to the realm of *Maya* although, in a secondary way they do in fact admit such solutions, two cases in point being the Vishnuite forms of Hinduism and in Buddhism the Pure Land doctrine on its more exoteric side ...

And so the sentences run on to an interminable length with cryptic references to five or six religious faiths. It becomes an impossible intellectual exercise for the average reader to follow the author.

Perhaps the only portion of the book which one can follow with some effort are the last three chapters on Mahāyāna Buddhism, dealing with the "Mystery of the Bodhisattva," "The Feminine Element in Mahāyāna," and the "Synthesis of the Pāramitās."

These remarks should not be construed as a wholesale condemnation of the book. Far from it. In every chapter there are profound observations which give some indication of the author's encyclopaedic knowledge of the great religions of the world. But the author expects from the reader a wealth of knowledge which not one in a thousand possesses. The circle of his readers, therefore, has to be very select and very small!

B. V. NARAYANA REDDY

The Scrolls and Christianity: Historical and Theological Significance. By W. F. ALBRIGHT, C. S. MANN, R. K. HARRISON, RAYMOND E. BROWN, JOHN PRYKE, CHARLES H. H. SCOBIE, F. F. BRUCE, MAX WILCOX, MATTHEW BLACK. Edited, with an Introduction and Concluding Chapter, by MATTHEW BLACK. (Theological Collections II. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (S.P.C.K.), London. 132 pp. 1969. 18*s*. 6*d*.)

This volume is a collection of eight essays by different eminent scholars, all experts in their respective fields of study, and it provides an interesting and

clear outline of the main discussions on the relationship between the Scrolls and New Testament studies.

The first essay is by W. F. Albright and C. S. Mann, who argue for the identification of the Qumran sect with the Essenes, and offer a tentative reconstruction of the history of this sectarian community. The next contributor is R. K. Harrison who presents a brief but adequate summary of the more important rites and customs practised by the Qumran sect. Raymond F. Brown discusses the identity and career of the Teacher of Righteousness (who is placed in the Maccabean period), as well as the expectations concerning the two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel, while John Pryke reviews the eschatological expressions found in the Dead Sea Scrolls, and questions the not uncommon conclusion that the "sect was thoroughgoing in its eschatology."

Charles H. H. Scobie examines the differences and resemblances between John the Baptist and the Qumran sect, avoiding any over-simplified conclusions. This comparison is appropriately followed by F. F. Bruce's masterly survey of various aspects relevant to the theme of "Jesus and the Gospels in the Light of the Scrolls." He points out that although there are a number of affinities, the divergencies are often quite radical.

Max Wilcox deals with "Dualism, Gnosticism, and other Elements in the Pre-Pauline Tradition," and the final essay is contributed by the editor, Matthew Black, who has produced an excellent study of the relevance of the Dead Sea Scrolls for the research into Christian origins. In his view Christianity had sprung from an Essene-type of Judaism but this Essenism was both transformed and transcended. The volume aptly concludes with the words of G. R. Driver, which sum up the essential theme of the whole book, that it is "the person and position of Christ which make the ultimate difference between the Gospel and the Scrolls."

A. A. ANDERSON

East-West Studies on The Problem of the Self. Edited by P. T. RAJU and ALBUREY CASTELL. (Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague. 234 pp. 1968)

East-West Conferences in philosophy were brought to prominence by the late Professor Charles Moore of Hawaii. The work was continued in America by the Conference on Comparative Philosophy and Culture at the College of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio, in April 1965. The Proceedings of the Conference have now been published in this volume.

The central topic of discussion was "The Problem of the Self." It has been a universal topic handled for generations from all possible angles. The mystical approach has a unity and simplicity of its own, but to discuss the problem of the Self philosophically is an arduous undertaking. The Conference at Wooster had representatives of different cultures. Out of seventeen papers read at the Conference as many as three are by Islamic scholars, one is Buddhist, and four are by Indian scholars. Dr. Raju, Dr. K. T. Ramanan, and Dr. A. K. Sarkar are familiar names of Indian scholars settled in America.

The concept of the Self is a very complex problem and can be studied in many aspects. The papers are all of a high standard. We are living in an age so highly mechanized that the value of the individual is apt to be lost. But that there is something in the Self which refuses to be reduced to an automaton is well brought out by the participants at the Conference. How interdependent the various cultures of the world are is also well brought out. While the metaphysical, psychological, and spiritual values receive their due recognition, one is inclined to agree with Professor McMurrin that not sufficient attention has been paid to "the social and moral dimension of the self."

The volume is a valuable addition to philosophical literature bringing out the close relationship between the East

and the West. Each may have its own distinctive features but both are essential to a full understanding of the Self.

A. R. WADIA

Strength to Love. By MARTIN LUTHER KING. (Fontana Books. William Collins Sons and Company Ltd., London. 160 pp. 1969. Paperback. 5*s*.)

There is a special goodness about these sermons, reprinted now after Martin Luther King's death; it could almost be called an American goodness. One of the tragedies of the images of our time is the distortion of the American image by the easy American critics. Beneath the façade of material strength, and the production of material marvels which never stops — and presumably never can stop — is a troubled American spirit moved by Christian values as perhaps no other Christian nation is. Martin Luther King is an American martyr. He knew that sooner or later he would be killed. If the American President's job is the most dangerous in the world there could have been little chance for the pacifist Negro leader. And he knew it. All Americans now know it.

These sermons speak out of an American civilization to which Martin Luther King dedicated himself, none the less because he condemned it and fought it so movingly. Three of them were written in prison. All of them are supremely serene in love overcoming suffering, and as such they can be read by anyone who longs to touch that need. Mahatma Gandhi would have understood — and how much is ultimately saved by the unity of such men!

E. G. LEE

Civilization, the Next Stage: The Importance of Individuals in the Modern World. By BRUCE ALLSOPP. (Oriel Press Ltd., Newcastle upon Tyne. 25*s*., i.e., £1.25)

It will be a great pity if this book, published in the provinces and written by an author better known to students of architecture than to the much wider public addressed here, were to miss that wider public, for it says a great many things which we need to hear at the present juncture in the life of Western man, and says them with cogency and wit.

It amounts to a re-thinking of our habitual ideas about the world we live in; it represents a transvaluation of values, an undermining of *idées reçues* and the substitution for them of a fresh understanding of reality; and it offers alternatives to the drifting irresponsibility and the unquestioning pessimism which infect the contemporary individual. Mr. Allsopp is responsible and optimistic enough, on the contrary, to see that individual, rather after the manner of Teilhard de Chardin, as "an ameliorating animal" which need not necessarily destroy itself.

The book is courageous in many ways, and does nothing to curry favour with the conventional: it suggests, for instance, that Western man must come off "the work standard" (since to justify man by work is to regard him as a slave), and that he had better come off "the marriage standard" too, and seriously consider whether "the family unit" is not an essentially sentimental way of organizing society. But it is impossible to do more in a brief note than emphasize that here is something *different* among books, the work of an original mind and a reliable heart which have taken a steady look at contemporary man and his society in almost all their aspects, diagnosed their ills, and come up with a hopeful prog-

nosis. For that is the most unusual thing about this unusual book: it is deeply rooted in hope for mankind, and that makes it both inspiring and a cause for gratitude.

R. H. WARD

Bhulabhai Desai. By M. C. SETALVAD. (Builders of Modern India Series. Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India. 376 pp. 1968. Rs. 4.00)

Bhulabhai Desai was one of the tragic heroes of our freedom struggle. In his last days, he smarted under a sense of injustice done to him by the Congress leaders. Ample justice has now been done to his memory by this well-documented biography by a close associate, himself a legal luminary, and its inclusion in the "Builders of Modern India Series" published by the Government of India.

Born in 1877 at Bulsar, Bhulabhai went to Bombay when he was fourteen, and had a brilliant academic career. After three years as a Professor in the Gujarat College, Ahmedabad, while he pursued his law studies, he became an advocate of the Bombay High Court in 1905, and "thereafter his legal career was an ever-rising triumphal march." The author gives instances of his skill and genius, and says that he "relied more on a mastery of legal principles than a knowledge of decided cases." Bhulabhai enjoyed an immense practice at the Bar, but, adds the author frankly: "Large-hearted as he was in many matters, none of these juniors who worked all these briefs for him was remunerated." He declined an Executive Councillorship in the Bombay Government in 1923. His wife, Ichchaben, was ill with cancer, and, in spite of treatment in England, she passed away. The author gives us touching glimpses of this good lady, to whom, incidentally, this book is dedicated.

Bhulabhai was a Liberal in politics, except for a brief interlude in 1917 as a Home Ruler. A change came in 1928 when he was asked by Gandhiji to plead the cause of the Bardoli peasants before the Enquiry Committee set up by Government subsequent to the successful *satyagraha* campaign conducted by Sardar Patel. He joined the Congress in 1930, and soon become the Provincial Congress Committee President and member of the Working Committee. He suffered imprisonment for a year for his Swadeshi Sabha activities in 1932-3. He entered the Central Legislative Assembly in 1935. The author recounts in some detail his great services to the national cause as Leader of the Swaraj Party. He was imprisoned a second time for offering individual *satyagraha* in 1940. Interesting excerpts from his Jail Diary are given, showing his deep disagreements with some of Gandhiji's ideas and methods. The author divines that "this was possibly the reason for the treatment he received subsequently."

Much space is devoted to the so-called "Desai–Liaquat-Ali Pact" (11 January 1945), which was still-born and was anyhow premature. It cost him dear. The Congress Working Committee was released on 15 June and in the prolonged negotiations for a Congress-League agreement to form a national Government, his name was omitted in the list furnished by the Working Committee. Later, he was not even chosen to stand for the Central Assembly. The author's painstaking documentation reveals that Mahatmaji was largely responsible. Nevertheless Bhulabhai's pride was deeply hurt. Gandhiji had stoutly defended Bhulabhai's *bona fides* in respect of his pact with Liaquat Ali. Why then did he block his political ambition? It is idle to speculate.

What followed shows Bhulabhai at his best, the last bright flicker of his life. Instead of sulking in his tents, he responded to the call of the Congress leaders, despite ill-health, to defend the I.N.A. prisoners standing their trial at the Red Fort. It was a magnificent

gesture and his crowning achievement as advocate and patriot. The strain was too great: he passed away a few months later, on 6 May 1946.

The author has made a valuable contribution to our national biographical literature and shed considerable light on the political events of the period. In spite of his partiality for the hero, he is objective and does not gloss over his failings and foibles.

K. SAMPATHGIRI RAO

Deshapriya Jatindra Mohan Sengupta. By PADMINI SENGUPTA. (180 pp. Rs. 2.50); *Romesh Chunder Dutt.* By R. C. DUTT. (258 pp. Rs.3.00) (Builders of Modern India Series. Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, New Delhi. 1968).

The Publications Division in its series "Builders of Modern India" has brought out the biography of "Deshapriya." As we know, the object of this series is to publish the biographies of eminent Indians who have contributed towards the building of a new India. This biography has been written by a close relative of Deshapriya J. M. Sengupta. In her Foreword, Smt. Nellie Sengupta, the wife of "Deshapriya," has mentioned certain qualities of Deshapriya:

> As Deshbandhu Chittaranjan Das, by dint of his love and sacrifice, had become the idol of undivided Bengal, so also had Jatin become the idol of Chittagong ... His love for his motherland had found expression even in his university days and his love for truth made him chivalrous in every walk of life ... his area activities spread not only from one end of India to the other, but also far beyond its borders; his field of activities embraced all spheres of life.

Smt. Sengupta has emphasized the loving nature of this great leader. He loved the members of his family, his friends, and the people at large. He was universally respected and his love of India made him fight the British Raj.

Deshapriya Sengupta had significantly declared in a speech in 1919, "I yield to none in my love of the country or in my desire to use myself in her service." This statement is the keynote of this biography. This builder of modern India always placed service before self and was an ardent fighter for the freedom of the Motherland.

The second biography is also in the same series and deals with the life of another great Indian, who was an eminent scholar-administrator and who served India through his writings and speeches. This biography has also been written by a close relative and contains an authentic and faithful portrayal of the dynamic life of Romesh Chunder Dutt.

Shri Romesh Chunder Dutt received English education in England and later on joined the I.C.S. During the course of his service he realized that the British rulers discriminated against Indian officers and always preferred English officers to Indians. He later on resigned from the I.C.S. and entered into active politics. Nevertheless he went on writing books on the greatness and grandeur of India as well as on the current political and economic problems. He became the Dewan of Baroda State, noted for its reforms in the sphere of public administration.

The new generation of Indians needs to know of the great men and women of modern India. The Publications Division is to be congratulated on bringing out the biographies in the series "Builders of Modern India."

SITA RAM JAYASWAL

Lucid Dreams. By CELIA GREEN. Foreword by H. H. PRICE. Proceedings of the Institute of Psychophysical Research, Oxford. Volume I. (194 pp. 1968. 32*s.* 6*d.*).

In this research, the term "lucid" is applied to dreams in which the subject is, or becomes, aware that he is dreaming. According to new material brought into the Institute, and studies of accounts by earlier writers, there is often no clear distinction between a lucid dream and an out-of-the-body experience, since the former is commonly associated with a sense of flying or floating, and objects seen in a room, landscapes, etc., appear to have a more realistic, less fantastic quality than ordinary dreams. The painstaking attempts made here to examine what is really happening in such dreams bring us straight to the question: what is unconsciousness or "the Unconscious"?

According to common-sense thinking "unconscious" is equivalent to "nothing occurring or registering." According to Hindu philosophy the unconscious state is a dynamic reality, a different order of being, usually inaccessible to the waking state; the dream-state being intermediate between the two levels. Some of the practitioners in depth psychology also support a rather similar viewpoint. In psychotherapy, the manifold dream-symbols, denoting more than themselves, are explored for their help in giving the dreamer access to the unconscious, especially its resources for dealing with his acute problems. But one person's attitude and way of approach to them, and his particular requirements from them, differ greatly from another's, and we have to know about him to understand his dreams. If we remember this, we understand that it is of great importance to human beings to establish a freer passage between the "two worlds" — whether we regard the latter as two objective or two purely psychological realities (or both!). The same truth obtains for analysands and for non-analysands.

The "lucid dreamers" quoted here seem to have found their way spontaneously to a more-than-ordinary degree of penetration into their deeper levels. "I know I am dreaming" means "outer and inner meet as equals." They often feel a greater intensity of being, wider powers, particularly those of a "psychic" nature, and an awareness of superlative beauty in the surroundings — an advance in awareness generally. But they also demonstrate a continual interplay between conscious and unconscious, a kind of urge to bring them closer together: sometimes a struggle between them. Subject B, for one, seems to be in the throes of a perpetual intellectual argument with himself or some imagined "other" as to the advantage to be gained by "lucidity" during his dreams. One supposed that "intellectual honesty" is paramount with him. On the other hand the three successive anaesthetic dreams quoted on p. 68, in which a mysterious "message" was never quite grasped and remembered, demonstrate the limits of what can be done, as if one should say, "We can never quite get it all!"

E. GWEN MOUNTFORD

Out-of-the-Body Experiences. By CELIA GREEN. Foreword by H. H. PRICE. (Volume II, Proceedings of the Institute of Psycho-physical Research, Oxford. 144 pp. 1968. 27*s.* 6*d.*)

In 1966 an appeal was made by means of the press and radio for first-hand accounts of experiences in which the subject had seemed to himself "to be observing things from a point located outside his physical body." About four hundred replies testified to such experiences (described in the book as "ecsomatic") and 251 of the correspondents completed two questionnaires. Thus an up-to-date enquiry revealed: first, that this remarkable phenomenon is not so very uncommon in this country; and

secondly, that reports of it vary widely in character but yet have enough consistency to enable much information about it to be sorted out and systematized.

Nearly all subjects state that the transition to the ecsomatic state and position is instantaneous, and entails no distress or strain. The state itself is commonly felt to be delightful, with a sense of release, wonder, and curiosity about the temporarily discarded body, in spite of complete "detachment" from it. But sometimes there is a feeling of fear on discovery of separation from the body, and of struggle to get back. One would expect these opposite reactions. Differences of attitude towards anything so uncanny and unwonted must depend on the psychological make-up of the individual, perhaps on its temporary fluctuations; or on the physical condition (moments of paralysis may be suffered).

Again and again we are assured that the intelligent faculties were unimpaired or even enhanced in the "I" which had escaped from its body. Sensorial power was often increased. Additional light might be present, or the whole room could be seen at a glance, walls were transparent, or colours were clear at night, or seemed living and indescribable in a way that recalls psychedelic impressions.

The reports confirm what has often been stated; that the ecsomatic experience brings an enriched state of awareness.

This is a study in which "subjectivity" must be accepted and taken seriously; no attempt to get past it on strict behaviourist lines will ever add much to it. But one wonders whether the "body image" of Schilder and other psychologists may be relevant to it.

E. GWEN MOUNTFORD

We Murder Men Everywhere: The Dehumanization of Mankind. By NICHOLAS FOGG. (Prism Education Pamphlets. Prism Publications Ltd., London. 33 pp. 1969. 2*s.* 6*d.*).

Ten years ago we in the West thought the main division in the world was between capitalist, democratic "free" societies and Communist, authoritarian, "closed" societies. Now we are realizing we were wrong; for ideological divisions pale into insignificance compared with the accelerating gap between the rich, technologically advanced nations of the North, and the poor, technologically under-developed nations of the South. The gulf between Dives and Lazarus is more important politically, morally, and spiritually than the difference between Marx and Mill. Nicholas Fogg, who is a full-time education worker for the British Christian Aid charity, has delineated the nature and origins of the exploitive relationships between the West and the "Third World." Many will regard his analysis as inadequate. Certainly his neglect of the Indian non-violent revolutionary experience and the impact of Bhave's *Bhoodan* upon the sub-continent is a major omission. Yet his discussion contains much to challenge new thinking — both in Asia and the West.

BRIAN G. COOPER

Ends and Sayings

"... ends of verse
And sayings of philosophers."
—SAMUEL BUTLER: *Hudibras*

Professor John Weightman (*Encounter,* July 1969) has made a most penetrating study of "The Concept of the *Avant-Garde,*" particularly in relation to French literature.

He considers the somewhat muddled emphasis of the *Nouveau Roman* on change, obsolescence, irrationality. Its followers wish to throw away the past as useless, and not even today counts, against the future, however formless. There is "the rejection of all existing knowledge, in the conviction that something new and better will emerge spontaneously from the resulting vacuum." Professor Weightman agrees that the moral and aesthetic judgements of the arts cannot be pinned down in scientific terms; that discarding accepted opinions to make a fresh assessment in the light of new criteria is valuable; but this irrational jettisoning of the past to hurry after the future is catastrophic. He suggests that science began "the general change-over from the static or cyclical view of human existence to the evolutionary view" and traces its influence on philosophy and literature in France since the seventeenth century. The eighteenth-century "Enlightenment" presented "human life as a process in time," without relationship to any possible existence outside time (eternity or God). Man's only meaning must be "within the flux of history" — hence the *avant-garde* writers' conflict, a simultaneous endeavour to identify with the flux, and to escape from its perpetual nightmare into some substitute for eternity (e.g., the refuge of Catholicism).

Professor Weightman considers the two views of man's nature — that he needs to return to his natural state and the evolutionary theory of a future perfection. But:

> Egoistic self-assertiveness may be thought more natural than collective altruism, instinct and impulse more natural than reason, accident and randomness more natural than deliberate arrangement, inarticulate noises more natural than speech, and the body more natural than the mind ... And once randomness and irrationalism have been accepted as principles, anything goes.

But in the *avant-garde* writers' revolt against society their notions of the future have become clichés as much as society's conventions.

History is seen as "no more than a succession of moments" and human nature "no more than the name we give to the successive appearances of man." Though scientific law works in the kingdoms of nature, it seems without relation to human consciousness. Hence the search for the transcendent, through drugs and so on. The randomness of dreams and insanity are considered to give a higher truth than reason. Here Professor Weightman comments perceptively:

> I agree that reason is not enough. Reason cannot invent. Invention is a leap into the future which depends on imagination or intuition ... and reason can do no more than test the results of invention. But I remain convinced that all genuine works are connected ultimately with the rational faculty and indeed feed the reason and help it towards truths that it can eventually define in its own terms.

To emphasize the meaninglessness of life, *avant-garde* writers obscure language in various ways, or produce a linguistic labyrinth, with "no exit on to any reality." Professor Weightman declares that, despite living in flux without any "fixed and clear basis for our moral and aesthetic assumptions,"

he cannot feel these are arbitrary, but are something we must continue to try to understand.

One might perhaps pose some further questions. Why should evolution not be a spiral, so that the golden past is reached again, on a higher curve, in a future millennium, plus the experience gained through the flux of time? Is man's original nature really the animal or egoistic one? Whence comes his intuition, imagination, or even his reason? Professor Weightman writes: "We *are* the past which is living in the present," and is it not true that every "renaissance" has been born from a return to the past, an ardent exploration of its forgotten treasures? Could we not, if we wish to approach the mystery of "Be-ness — Becoming — Being," question the past with fresh open minds?

The journal of the Crusade Against All Cruelty to Animals, *With Sword and Shield,* reprints (February–June 1969) from *Life* magazine a pertinent article, "Must We Have Zoos?" by Dr. Desmond Morris, former curator of mammals at London Zoo. The potential value of zoos, he writes, is to make urban populations aware of the "realness" of animals in a way that no artificial representation can; and, further, to provide zoologists with valuable intimate conditions for observing and understanding animal behaviour and intelligence, since the increasing destruction of their natural wild habitats makes this more and more difficult. But, as a legacy from the past, present-day zoos (with few exceptions) force restrictions, physical and psychological, on the animals and birds — a monotonous, hygienically-sterile, mass produced cage environment, the removal of every varied challenge and pleasure that life offers naturally — and so bring about "behavioural starvation" and turn the zoo animal into "a travesty of evolution." Those who demand a change in the character of zoos do not, he says, sentimentally anthropomorphize the creatures, but sympathetically recognize that their basic needs are not only nutritional. The frustration of behaviour patterns which have taken millions of years to evolve is actual cruelty.

> Weaverbirds should be allowed to weave, beavers to build dams, apes to construct beds, elephants to bathe, bowerbirds to erect bowers, young chimps to swing and play, deer to form mud wallows, wolves to scent posts and bears to climb trees. Above all, social species must be allowed to live in natural social groups of the correct size and composition and not always in neat pairs, as if they were candidates for some ludicrous Noah's Ark, or worse still, singly, in a painful solitary confinement.

Since the animals will benefit, the public will find a greater interest and understanding in watching them coping creatively with problems. For the researcher, observations of a few specimens (probably psychologically abnormal through cage conditioning) is inadequate and misleading. Each species needs its own particular environment, and groups of fifty to a hundred members of each in a closely-related community provide the most natural social picture, for fruitful investigation. Thus it will be essential for zoos to specialize.

There is no need to cram something of everything into one place, since people are now accustomed to travel for sightseeing. There are already one or two monkey zoos

> in almost completely natural surroundings, wandering about in typical social groups in living foliage criss-crossed with public tree-walks.

There are deer-park zoos, a very popular water-fowl one, and Dr. Morris offers suggestions for other species. Zoos must stop plundering the wild and breed their own stock, and thus help at need to redress the balance elsewhere. They must "change the animal slums," the stereotype of the "naked cage," or they will find themselves "outlawed and condemned."

Clifford Hanley in "Productivity? Rubbish!" (*Daily Telegraph Magazine*, 18 July 1969) hurls a few lively brickbats at one of today's sacred idols. But behind his light-footed sallies there is much sound common sense. He attacks the obsession of production for production's sake (no matter what rubbish is produced) and all the useless and unnecessary "wants" that it engenders. If things are produced

> *somebody* has to want them. To survive as a nation, the story goes, we all have to produce things like maniacs; things my grandfather never heard of and wouldn't have wanted anyway.

True, in his time most people were short of necessities, through lack of money, and to remedy this was the aim of reformers — but now, when there seem prospects of most people being able to have these, comes a desperate swing into nightshift work on the production of gimmicks and non-essentials. Car production is so speeded up that mountains of last year's cars are dumped all over the country to make room for the new ones.

> And don't tell me all this frantic activity is making society any better to live in. For a start, the people making the cars obviously don't enjoy it. If they did, they wouldn't keep striking all the time. And the rest of us are beginning to realize that it isn't much fun owning the things either. We're producing Concorde, but who *wants* it?

We are threatened that if we do not *produce* (rubbish or not) we shall lose the export war, and cannot import. But foreign suppliers of imports are catching the rubbish-producing craze too. The purpose of society is "not for making things, it's for fun." Here one must query the meaning of "fun," since often the desire for "fun" makes people fall for the rubbish. The purpose of society is surely to enable people to get on better with each other, and to benefit, inwardly and outwardly, from the interaction. That is satisfying "fun."

Peter Preston (*The Guardian*, 19 July 1969) attacks television for trivializing life values.

> It isn't just that the medium comes before the message. Sometimes it obscures the message totally; always the message is perverted to fit the medium.

He writes of the televising of public events, like the recent Investiture of the Prince of Wales, the discussion of serious topics, or the reporting of current world activities and problems. One is made so much aware of the personalities of the commentators etc. that trivial details like a change of hair-style, mannerisms of speech, signs of boredom, stick visually in the memory, while the subject-matter sinks into oblivion. Participants in any televised event are forced by the very demands of the producers to assume the role of performers. Television does not adjust to the events, but conditions them simply into a spectacle. Invented programmes and the presentation of real events are all the same, and, without any distinction made between actuality and something in the stream of stuff viewers "saw on the telly," "the emotional impact — the reality even — of every event is diminished, impoverished." The attempt to land on the moon is made "a three-ring circus," a "time-filler" with the astronauts obeying the anonymous producer's demands for more titivation to keep viewers awake.

Mr. Preston is right about the trivializing, but what is the remedy? For real and fruitful interdependence we need Self-dependence, not personal other-dependence. Yet how can we depend on a Self not known? Modern psychology seldom ventures beyond the body-mind, and to go further we must turn to the soul-satisfying philosophy of the ancient East, which even its Westernized sons have largely forgotten.